The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1892.

The Week.

CONGRESSMAN BRECKINRIDGE remarked of the President's message that it was "an excellent presentation by an admirable lawyer of a case he is prosecuting against an adversary." There certainly is in it a cavalier disregarding of the findings of the Chilian court, and of the evidence presented, which is more befitting a lawyer's harangue before a jury than a judicial statement. Thus, the Chilians brought forward evidence to show that the refugees in the American Legation had insulted the police. The President dismisses this by simply saying: "It seems to me incredible." In a similar *a-priori* way does he dispose of the charges and the evidence against Admiral Brown: "The charge is too base to gain credence with any one who knows his high personal and professional character." This may be a slanting allusion to Secretary Tracy, who admitted as he could not well help doing in face of the evidence, that Brown had given valuable military information to Balmaceda. Throughout, moreover, the President accepts the *ex-parte* testimony taken in California as more credible than the sworn and sifted evidence given in court in Valparaiso. The danger and absurdity of this were immediately exposed in a specimen case: A sailor who, by the time he reached Vallejo, remembered all sorts of damaging things against the Chilian police, in Valparaiso testified that he was confused and frightened in the row and saw nothing definite whatever. The legal force of the message is greatly impaired by such a procedure, as no one has pointed out more forcibly than the intimate friend of Mr. Blaine, ex-Senator Henderson.

The Valparaiso press publishes, both in translation and in the English original, a document showing how Egan's son was given the power of attorney to press a claim for $5,750,000 against the Chilian Government. This fact has been vaguely referred to before in despatches from Valparaiso, but complete verification of it has been lacking until now on account of a mistake made in the name of the notary before whom the affidavit was made; it was given as Wolle or Wolly, but turns out to be Molloy. The Secretary of the Brooklyn company urging the claim was highly suspicious when asked questions about the affair by a reporter, and referred the inquirer to "his attorney." But the fact is now beyond question. We believe that Egan himself admits that his son received the power of attorney, but asserts that he never acted under it. That, however, is not saying he would not have acted if the Balmaceda Government had not gone to smash in a few days after the receipt of the document in Chili. The main significance of the affair lies in the fact that the company knew that the name of Egan was a power in the Dictator's day. But we are amazed at the modesty that was content to put "damages" at so small a sum as $5,750,000!

The selection of Chicago as the place for holding the Democratic National Convention was brought about apparently by considerations of convenience, and not by the efforts of "boomers." In fact, Chicago seems not to have been a candidate at all, being a little uneasy lest the awarding of the Convention to her should detract something from her claims to an appropriation for the World's Fair. So far as local feeling and influence go, Chicago is and will will be a hotbed of Clevelandism, which no new-born zeal for John M. Palmer can lessen or offset. Indeed, Senator Palmer himself will, most likely, contribute his full quota to the Cleveland strength in the Convention.

The outgiving of news from Washington that Mr. Blaine is about to write a letter withdrawing from the Presidential contest altogether, has been so often repeated that it has become a trifle stale and rather a subject of mirth. Yet it comes to us through such a channel that we cannot doubt its accuracy. Mr. Blaine, whatever his inclinations might otherwise be, is aware that his impaired health would not permit him to be a candidate. There are so many Republicans, however, who would rather vote for Mr. Blaine's effigy than for Mr. Harrison, that the former has been restrained from making public his intentions respecting the nomination. He may be restrained some time longer. It would probably be gratifying to him to show his chief that he is the stronger of the two in the party councils—to show this in a way that does not admit of doubt or dispute. But that Mr. Blaine should be seriously a candidate for the Presidential nomination this year is incredible and impossible.

The death of Justice Bradley removes from the Supreme Bench of the United States its oldest member. He was born in March, 1813, and was consequently within a few weeks of completing his seventy-ninth year. He was one of those men who, like the late Justice Miller, enter the legal profession rather late, but with so strong a bent for it and with such concentration of purpose that they rise steadily to the top. The story goes that it was from the first his ambition to reach the Supreme Bench of the nation, but it was not until he was fifty-seven years old that his hopes were gratified by President Grant's offer of a place. He was entitled to retire on a pension thirteen years later, upon attaining the age of seventy, but he enjoyed the work and preferred to remain in active service. He was a man of broad legal learning, of a keen and analytical mind, and his decisions carried great weight with lawyers. To the general public he stood only as one of the Supreme Court, except during the period of the Electoral Commission, when he constituted one of the majority in the "eight to seven" votes of that body, and was singled out by the Democrats as meriting especial reproach therefor, although in point of fact there was no more reason for blaming him than the other two judges who stood with him. President Harrison has now another chance to appoint a member of our highest judicial tribunal. He has already had two vacancies on this bench to fill, and when he has named Bradley's successor, one-third of the judges will bear his commissions. There have occurred during his Administration an unusually large number of vacancies in the subordinate courts, and he has been charged with the appointment of judges for the new Court of Appeals. Altogether his four-years' term will include more judicial appointments than have fallen to the lot of any other President. It is most fortunate that Mr. Harrison is well qualified for this branch of the Executive's duties.

Mr. Bland introduced his free-coinage bill in the House on Thursday. It repeals the present silver act, and provides that the new Treasury notes issued under it shall be cancelled as fast as they come into the Treasury, and that notes of a new kind shall be issued in place of them. These are called "coin notes." The legal-tender character of the existing notes shall not be changed, but the "coin notes" are not to be legal tender. Any person may deposit gold or silver bullion at the mint and receive therefor either coin or coin notes. The most curious part of the bill is one which provides that "as soon as France reopens her mints to the free and unrestricted coinage of silver at her present ratio, fifteen and one-half to one, the President of the United States is to immediately make public proclamation of that fact, whereupon the said ratio shall be the legal ratio in the United States, and thereafter the standard silver dollar shall consist of 400 grains of standard silver, and the laws relating to the standard silver dollars of 412½ grains standard silver shall be applicable to the new dollar of 400 grains. The silver dollars of 412½ grains are then to be recoined as fast as practicable into dollars of 400 grains." What would happen in case France, after reopening her mint, should again close it? Would our ratio then change back to the old figure of 16,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or would it remain at 15½? And would the dollar of 400 grains be the "dollar of the fathers," or some other kind of a dollar? Mr. Bland's bill is such an oddity that we cannot consider it likely to pass the House, still less to become a law.

Senator Manderson reported on January 12, from the Committee on Printing, a "Bill providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," which was placed upon the Senate Calendar, and was made a special order for Monday. This is a measure of broad scope, which it is difficult succinctly to analyze, but it may briefly be stated that it attempts (1) to define the duties of the Joint Committee on Printing, and its relation to the Public Printer; (2) to define the duties and powers of the Public Printer, and to formulate general rules for the administration of the Government Printing-office and Bindery; and (3) to codify the statutes relating to the whole subject of the printing and distribution of the public documents. That part of the bill which attempts to regulate the printing and distribution of the public documents is of special interest and importance. Every one knows something of the chaotic and inadequate manner in which the great mass of literature included under the above designation is now produced and distributed, and any serious attempt to bring about a better state of things is welcome. The provisions as to what documents are to be printed and the number of copies of each, are minute and apparently exhaustive, but want of space forbids any detailed examination of them here.

Regarding the distribution of the public documents, the bill, in addition to providing for folding-rooms and document-rooms such as already exist, creates a new office. The Superintendent of Documents is to be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, at a salary of $3,000 a year; and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, Doorkeeper of the House, and Public Printer are, between them, to provide office and storage rooms for his use, and he is to have general supervision of the distribution of all public documents. He is also charged with the sale of documents, and is to prepare a comprehensive index to all the documents of each session of Congress, as well as a "consolidated index of Congressional documents," and the indexes to special documents when so directed by the Joint Committee on Printing. It is also made his duty to prepare a monthly catalogue of Government publications which is to be printed in the *Official Gazette* of the Patent Office, and on the first of July of each year he is to print a catalogue of the documents issued during the previous year. All accumulations of unused documents in departments and bureaus are to be turned over to him at intervals of one or two years, and he is to distribute them, giving preference to libraries and to the completion of sets, after sending out printed statements of the documents in his possession for this purpose. The Superintendent of Documents is also given authority to investigate the condition of libraries that are designated depositories of public documents, and if he ascertains that the number of books in any such library is below one thousand volumes, exclusive of Government publications, or that it has ceased to be a free public library, he is given authority to strike its name from the list. It may be stated, in conclusion, that under this bill public libraries are likely to fare better than heretofore as depositories of documents. As a rule, some 500 copies of the various Government publications are set aside to go to libraries, and when extra copies of any work are ordered, the number reserved for libraries is increased until the total number reaches 1,000, except in the case of the Patent Office *Gazette*, of which a very large extra number of copies is distributed free to public libraries.

Mr. Bernhard Quaritch, the London bookseller, has written a letter to "the Honorable William McKinley, Governor of Ohio, Cleveland, U. S. A.," on the subject of the duty on books under the laws of the United States. Mr. Quaritch is apparently under the impression that Mr. McKinley still has some position of influence in reference to the tariff. But that error is of no moment. What he writes is equally useful whether addressed to Wm. McKinley or to Wm. M. Springer or to Benjamin Harrison. Mr. Quaritch is a dealer in old books, which are free of duty under our tariff. As we have no manufactory of old books, his observations do not touch the question of protection. He says that many books bear no dates, and thus fall under the suspicion of the customs authorities. Some works consist of two or more volumes, only one of which may be twenty years old, while the others are under that age, thus leading to doubt and uncertainty at the Custom-house. Some books more than twenty years old have modern bindings, in which case the *Boston* Custom-house officers assume that the binding makes the whole book dutiable. Even if this is a correct decision, Mr. Quaritch maintains that nobody, not even the most skilled expert, can pronounce with accuracy upon the date of a binding. Finally, although old books and books in foreign languages are duty free, yet if they contain plates in considerable number, they are liable to duty on the engravings. These smaller barbarisms (the word is ours, not Mr. Quaritch's) might be avoided by putting a specific duty on all books, new or old, no matter in what language, of, say, ten dollars per hundred pounds. This would avoid disputes at the Custom-house, and would be more satisfactory to the importers of books than the present system, and would afford equal protection to the native industries.

The Republicans of Pennsylvania are choosing delegates to a State Convention which is to nominate a candidate for Justice of the Supreme Court. Among the delegates already elected in Philadelphia are three Appraisers who were indicted for their complicity in the Bardsley frauds. In the same city have also been nominated for reëlection by the Republicans two magistrates who admitted before the Councils Committee that they permitted Bardsley to retain portions of the costs and fees when a settlement was made with him for the delinquent mercantile taxes of 1890; the reason for their payment of tribute being the outrageous costs which they had themselves piled up, one of them having charged $8.76 for each dollar taken in, and the other extorting $36 for the collection of $1. The *Press* pronounces it a gross scandal to renominate these offenders, and asks to have the convention called to "undo this work and remove this taint of Bardsleyism from the magisterial bench." But what will the men who run the machine care for such protests? They know that the *Press* will never refuse to support the party.

Gov. Flower's appointment of Isaac H. Maynard as a Judge of the Court of Appeals is recognized by the Democratic press as so indefensible that they receive it in silence. There is nothing in his career to commend him for this exalted position. He has been a politician of the "pernicious activity" kind for nearly twenty years. He began as a member of the Assembly from Delaware County, and though his skill as a politician was sufficient to get him elective office in that county, he has never been able to command popular support in the State at large. He was elected County Judge and Surrogate there in 1877, and his service on that bench constitutes his entire judicial experience. He was the Democratic candidate for Secretary of State in 1883, and was defeated, running behind his ticket. He then secured the appointment of Deputy Attorney-General at Albany, and in 1885 Secretary Manning appointed him Second Comptroller in the Treasury Department at Washington. Secretary Fairchild promoted him to the post of Assistant Secretary, and in that position he originated the bogus "sugar-fraud" charges against officials in the New York Custom-house, and used them as an excuse for making fifteen removals.

After his departure from the Treasury Department, Mr. Maynard was again appointed Deputy Attorney-General at Albany. When the Democratic State Convention met last summer, he appeared before it as Gov. Hill's candidate for Attorney-General, but found so little encourage-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment for his claims that he left town before the balloting began, and his name was not presented to the Convention. When Gov. Hill began his campaign for the control of the Senate, after election, Mr. Maynard acted as his ally and agent in instigating the County Canvassing Boards to the various fraudulent proceedings which culminated in the theft of the Dutchess County seat by the State Board of Canvassers. He was the recognized "counsel" of the Onondaga and Dutchess County Canvassing Boards, in which the most outrageous frauds were committed. His activity in this work is universally admitted to have constituted his chief claim to the present appointment, and Gov. Flower in making it is generally regarded as using a Court of Appeals judgeship as payment for a political debt. Nobody pretends that Mr. Maynard's legal attainments or judicial experience entitles him to the position. The appointment is only for a short term, but such an appointment is usually regarded as giving the appointee a claim upon the nomination for the position when the candidates for election to it are selected.

It is a great pity that the editor of the *North American Review* should, in his last number, have lent the magazine to a transparent fraud by printing an article in defence of Tammany as the composition of the "Hon. Richard Croker," which was not written by Croker at all, and which Croker is no more capable of writing than of calculating an eclipse. The *North American Review* has a history which ought to protect it from such degradation. A genuine article on Tammany from Croker, written without assistance, would have considerable political interest as showing the world outside the city the kind of man the ruler of the city is, and elucidating the municipal annals for future generations. But a windy and absolutely disingenuous apology for Tammany, fraudulently attributed to Croker, is something which ought not to have found its way into a respectable periodical. An air of low comedy is given to the table of contents by sticking in the "Croker" article between one by Anthony Comstock on "Lotteries and Gambling" and the first of a series on "The Olympian Religion" by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Both Comstock and Gladstone are entitled to more consideration. Nothing does more to promote political and social degradation than the treatment by the newspapers of serious people and things as comic, and of comic people and things as serious. We ought to have at least two magazines, relying on literature solely and not on pictures for their support, which would not lend themselves to these travesties.

Compromise is certainly stamped all over the final form of words adopted by the Presbyterian Revision Committee in regard to preterition and other leading doctrines of the Calvinistic system. The old substance is grasped after in saying that "God saw fit . . . not to elect . . . the rest of mankind," and that "them he ordained to dishonor and wrath"; yet all is really abandoned in conceding, "nor is it his decree, but the wickedness of their own hearts" which plays the mischief with them. Such a prophesying of smooth things to suit the itching ears of an evil generation would have been enough to call out the sternest rebuke of a man like John Knox, and we suppose that the minority vote in the General Committee against the report was cast by men who stood for the old conception of a "decree" as a thing that did what it set out to do. A like concession to carnal minds appears in the revised form of the doctrine "Of Good Works." The Westminster roundly declared these "sinful" when done by "unregenerate men," after the good old way of calling heathen virtues "splendid vices"; but this is now to be weakened into the assertion that they "do not meet the requirements of the divine law, hence they cannot be pleaded as a ground of acceptance with God." Evidently this is not so far from the idea of the candidate for orders who told his examiners, when asked what was the Church of England's doctrine of good works, "that a few of them would do no harm."

Some interesting statistics are published in a London journal relating to an exhaustive inquiry into the causes of the poverty of 152 families in a certain city district containing a population of 126,000. These families presented a wide variety in trade and religion and nationality, and their application for charitable assistance was taken as *prima-facie* and confessed evidence of poverty. Investigation showed that forty-two families were brought to want by their own fault, the causes of their poverty being set down as "reckless improvidence," "crime," "drink," "idleness," "bad temper," etc. Then come fifty-three families whose poverty was due to certain common accidents or misfortunes which might have been provided against, but were not. The final group of fifty-seven families presents cases of excusable poverty, such as those due to extraordinary slackness of trade or the absolute destruction of some branch of business, though even in this group appear twenty-one families who are made hopelessly poor by "incompetence." The whole result goes to show the untrustworthiness of the figures often cited of the number of persons in London and other cities who are unemployed, and said to be "able and willing to work if they could only get employment." A similar conclusion is led up to by an article of Prof. Hyslop's in a late issue of the New York *Independent*, in which he showed the astonishingly high percentage of the unworthy who apply to charitable organizations in this city for aid.

The heat which marks the relations between France and England regarding Egypt seems likely to be intensified by the trouble which has recently arisen in Morocco. Some of the tribes from the southern frontier have risen against the Sultan, and have forced their way nearly to the capital. This has caused an assemblage of the Spanish, French, and British Mediterranean fleets at Tangier, ostensibly to look after the interests of their own resident subjects, but really to get a share of the empire in case it breaks up. The Spaniards say their claim is stronger than any other, inasmuch as they have held Ceuta and other ports for two centuries, have thrashed the Moroccans in one recent war, and have always been considered the heirs of the last Sultan, whoever he might be. The French appear with a claim founded on the recent aggression of a Moroccan tribe on an Algerine tribe, on their having beaten the Moroccan army in the war with Abd-el-Kader, and on their having at one time bombarded Mogador and Tangier. Great Britain claims only the port of Tangier, on the strength of having owned Tangier in the seventeenth century, and on the theory that it is the complement of Gibraltar, and ought properly to belong to the Power which holds Gibraltar, inasmuch as if Tangier were in the hands of an enemy, Gibraltar could not be provisioned. She does not care who has the rest of Morocco, but Lord Salisbury gives notice pretty plainly, through the *Standard*, that England is going to have Tangier, no matter what any one else thinks about it.

The Panama Canal share and bond-holders are still besieging the Government of France to advance the money or to guarantee the interest on a loan sufficient to complete the work as a canal with locks. The amount which they consider necessary is $180,000,000. The Government has declined to accede to the prayer of the petitioners, and even the Deputies who present the petitions have no confidence in their ability to persuade the Government to assume the desperate undertaking. The concession from the Colombian Government will expire on the 28th of February, 1893, if the work is not resumed. Although the Chamber of Deputies declined to recommend a subvention or a guarantee, it voted a resolution inviting the Minister of Justice to institute criminal proceedings against the promoters of the enterprise if the facts developed by the investigation should warrant them. When those proceedings are properly pushed, we shall perhaps find out how much of the money of the peasants and shop-keepers and chambermaids was pocketed by the journalists who furnished the wind power for De Lesseps.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE ULTIMATUM."

SOME of our morning contemporaries were very amusing reading on Tuesday, so many of them were prepared for war and determined to die around the American flag. What led to this droll spectacle was the belief into which they had persuaded themselves, with the help of the Navy officers, that the Chilians were an insolent and conceited people, ignorant of our power and resources, and that, therefore, they were sure to fight sooner than make amends in any way for the Valparaiso affair. As the *Evening Post* said, in answer to a naval officer who produced this view in its columns, if the Chilians engaged in a war with the United States,

"it would show either that the governing class had gone stark mad, or were as ignorant of our resources as Sitting Bull or Rain-in-the-Face. But we know they are neither stark mad nor brutally ignorant. They are shrewd, well-equipped statesmen, who have established and carry on a civilized government which does not suffer by comparison with our own or that of any European country."

The ultimatum despatched by President Harrison on Thursday last was the first formal statement of our demands that we have made, and they have promptly complied with them. With regard to the apology required, it would have been childish to refuse it, as the dispute was over words. The correspondence shows that Señor Matta spoke of the Valparaiso outrage on October 27 as a "deplorable occurrence" and "lamentable affair" (Egan withheld these expressions in his despatch). On December 11 Señor Montt spoke of "the lamentable events at Valparaiso which his Government had deeply deplored." He repeated this in substance December 19. On January 4 the new Chilian Minister of Foreign Affairs spoke of "the occurrence of October 16 which Chili has lamented and does sincerely lament." On January 8 the Minister in Washington wrote to Mr. Blaine:

"I have also received special instructions to state to the Government of the United States that the Government of Chili has felt very sincere regret for the unfortunate events which occurred in Valparaiso on the 16th of October."

If we had not the President's Message before us, we should find difficulty in believing that a civilized Power had refused to accept these expressions as a sufficient apology from a "sister republic" for the acts of a street mob. But the President says expressly that it is not enough to say the affair was "lamentable," or that it is "regretted." He wants something more, and he furnishes a model of what he wants in Mr. Webster's despatch on the occasion of the mob's attack on the Spanish Consulate at New Orleans in 1851. Mr. Webster there says the attack was "a disgraceful and flagrant breach of duty and propriety," and that "these acts have caused the President great pain." The Chilians, of course, are willing to adopt Mr. Webster's language if it makes President Harrison feel any easier. To go to war for the difference would be the act of a child. The way the President labors over this point is enough to make grown men smile.

The Message is, in fact, throughout rather an Indianapolis brief in a suit for damages than a diplomatic state paper. It is studiously insulting to the Chilians from first to last. It insists upon it that the attack on the sailors was evidence and expression of general Chilian hostility to the United States, in spite of the solemn disavowals of the Chilian Government. It treats the findings of the Chilian courts as unworthy of credit, and the assertions of Chilian officers as unworthy of belief. It accuses the "Chilian authorities" of lying when they charged "the refugees and inmates of the legation with insulting the police" through the windows; the President's authorities for this contradiction being Egan, who is himself a foreign fugitive from justice, and the refugees, some of whom were notorious criminals. On the strength of an *ex-parte* investigation conducted by a naval commander on board his own ship, he treats the results of the Chilian investigations on shore as "evasion and subterfuge," intended "to cloud his [the President's] clear vision of this brutal work." If the President had had any diplomatic training, this would all deserve severe criticism; but in view of the fact that his training has consisted in thirty years' practice before Indiana juries, we forbear. The Chilians have inflicted on him the severest possible punishment for his "brutal work" by surrendering without seeing the Message. There is something very ludicrous in this termination of the controversy. We are afraid it will be taken in very bad part at the Navy Department. Is there not very gross insolence in giving in without hearing the President's arguments? Does it not call for a "naval movement" of some kind to make them listen to it before apologizing?

The unkindest cut of all, however, is the offer to submit the matter of the attack on the sailors to the Supreme Court of the United States. This is the second time since Mr. Blaine and Gen. Harrison came into charge of our diplomacy that this slight has been inflicted on them by a foreign disputant. It is a great compliment to the Supreme Court, but it must be confessed it is a good deal of a slight on the State and Navy Departments. Ought this to be allowed to pass unrebuked by some sort of demonstration? Does it not contain a subtle insinuation that the foreign cause is a good one, that the Supreme Court will probably proclaim it to be just, and that gentlemen cannot safely or profitably negotiate with the State Department? We think it does. If the navy-yards agree with us, ought we not to punish this "preterition" by "vigorous action"?

We cannot take leave of this tedious business, of which the public is already very tired, without a word of friendly remonstrance to our naval friends, who have been mainly instrumental in diffusing the belief that there would be, and would have to be, war with Chili. There was a very significant sentence or two at the close of an article in the last number of the *Financial Chronicle*, apropos of the alarm of war which greatly disturbed business in Wall Street last week. It was this:

"Yet when an hysterical letter from the commander of one of our proudest ships down in Chilian waters, given out by the Navy Department, was published by the daily press, with lots of other warlike news, and when added to that the market opened with rumors of letters received from official sources by our most reputable banking-houses, asserting that war was inevitable, traders became alarmed, destructionists cultivated the apprehension, and a break followed. This condition of affairs was, however, but of short duration; *though it may be worth while to add that the country does not seem to take quite the same kind of interest in its navy that it did a week ago.*"

This means that the naval officers have been displaying great indiscretion in their way of making sure of large appropriations for the new navy. They have sought to back themselves up with the public and Congress, by pretending that all the activity in the navy-yards called for by the large additions now making to our naval force was preparation for war; and they have "stuffed" the newspaper correspondents, week after week, for this purpose with silly stories about the necessity and certainty of war. Some of them have injected themselves into the diplomatic controversy, and have, against all rules of military discipline and propriety, almost taken the stump in order to inflame the public mind against a small and friendly country at present laboring under great internal difficulties. Now the public—every civilized public in the world—resents, sooner or later, the efforts of military men to bring on a war. In all free countries the question of peace and war is reserved for solution by civilians. This country did not need to be stimulated into liberality towards the navy by any extravagant language and false pretences. The Navy has in this instance gone so far as to produce somewhat of a reaction, and prejudice the sober-minded portion of the community against it. Many people are disposed to day to say to Commander Schley, for instance, gallant officer and agreeable man though he be, what the Irish policeman said to the noisy man in the court-room: "Silence is all we want from you, and very little of that."

CONCERNING WAR AS A REMEDY.

IT was the generally accepted opinion of the well-to-do class, the class known as "gentlemen" in all European countries, even a century ago, that what was called an "insult" had to be, on pain of social disgrace, punished by the person insulted by fighting the insulter with some kind of weapon. An insult, under the "laws of honor," was any language or act expressive of contempt for the insulted, or likely to lessen the consideration in which he was held in the society in which he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lived. The history of the duel is so well known that there is no need, for our present purpose, to sketch it. It doubtless originated in the desire of the offended party to kill the offender, and in his belief that he could kill him, and thus satisfy his barbaric thirst for simple vengeance. It became after a while what we now see it—as it exists on the European continent and in the Southern States—a means of showing the public that the challenger is not deficient in physical courage, and that anybody who insults him incurs a certain risk in doing so. But it has died out completely in England and the Northern States, not only under the growth of humanitarianism in both countries, but under the increasing application of what is called common sense, or, in other words, reasonableness, to the conduct of life.

The *absurdity* of the duel as a remedy has, in fact, had more to do with its extinction in these countries than anything else. The Pope has set forth this absurdity admirably in a recent Allocution for the benefit of the Italians more particularly. For instance, a man publicly calls you a liar. The injury thus inflicted under the duelling code lies almost wholly in the imputation it casts, not on your truthfulness, but on your personal courage. It connotes an expectation on the part of the accuser that you would not resent it in arms. You disprove this by fighting him, and either killing or wounding him, or letting him kill or wound you. In either case you set yourself right under the code—that is, if he wounds you, he has given you as much "satisfaction" as if you had wounded him. But the question of your veracity remains exactly where it was before the duel was fought. A man elopes with your wife, which is a deadly insult also, inasmuch as it indicates his belief that he can do so with impunity, and you are therefore "dishonored" if you do not fight him. Your honor is restored if you kill him, but it is restored just as effectively if he kills you. But even if you kill him, it does not restore your wife or your domestic peace. We might go through the whole category of offences requiring what the French call "réparation par les armes," with like result. The duel proves nothing except that neither of the disputants is afraid to fight. It decides no other question of fact, and rights no wrong except an accusation of personal cowardice.

But it is quite plain that the old duelling view of honor, and of fighting as a remedy, is by no means extinct in the conduct of national affairs. A great many public men and a great many newspapers have talked of the requirements of the present Chilian crisis in the exact language in which the duty of offended individuals used to be described in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, showing that in politics the duelling tradition about "honor" still lingers. It is quite true that the position of a peaceably disposed nation in our day is not exactly analogous to that of a peaceably disposed citizen who has the courts and police to appeal to for defence against wrong-doers. A nation is rather in the position of a peaceably disposed American or Englishman living in a duelling or semi-barbarous community. It has to provide for its own protection against violence and robbery, and in some manner to diffuse among its neighbors the belief that it would be dangerous to inflict injury on it. For this reason it has to carry arms openly and make open display of its willingness and ability to use them if necessary.

But any use of arms beyond what is absolutely necessary for the spread and maintenance of this conviction, and, above all, any reliance on arms as a ready remedy for a past wrong, is a relic of barbarism. It is, of course, impossible to lay down rules beforehand which shall exactly define a *casus belli* for a highly civilized Power. A *casus belli*, in intercourse with a quarrelsome or uncivilized community which did not know the strength of a great Power, and might be led by such ignorance into subsequent attacks on its citizens or insults to its flag, may arise far more readily than a *casus belli* with a neighbor in the same stage of civilization, and possessing an intimate knowledge of its history and resources. But in every case it has to be remembered that war as a *remedy* for past wrongs is utterly illogical. For example, if we have had two sailors killed in a riot in Chili, the notion that this wrong can be made good by our killing several hundred Chilian sailors and letting them kill several hundred more of ours, is almost childish. There would be a slight thread of reason in it if we could kill the Chilian sailors without letting them kill ours, because it could at least be said that it satisfied the old human love of revenge, which makes the murderer who lies in wait for his enemy a far more rational man than the duellist. But in chastising a public enemy by war there has to be a battle, and about the same loss of life on both sides, so that, when the war was over, we should have to charge Chili with the killing and wounding not of twenty or thirty men by a mob in a riot, but with the killing and wounding, say, of one thousand, of malice aforethought, and under the deliberate order and direction of the best minds in the Chilian Republic.

If we take the riot at Valparaiso as an evidence of Chilian ill-will to the United States, we are no better off in case of war. Mr. Wharton, in our first despatch to the Chilian Government of October 23, 1891, complains that the mob ("as we must conclude"!) "were animated in their bloody work by hostility to these men as sailors of the United States." He further says that the people of the United States had been pained by the "killing and pitiless wounding" of the sailors at Valparaiso "more as an apparent expression of an unfriendliness towards this Government" than as anything else. If we consider war as a remedy for this unfriendliness, it becomes almost grotesque in its absurdity. Our threatening it for this reason strikingly resembles the French Jacobin's "Sois mon frère, ou je te tue" (Be fraternal, or I'll cut your throat). To sink the Chilian fleet, and bombard Chilian ports, and invade and lay waste Chilian territory in order to cure "unfriendliness," or "hostility," would far surpass in unreasonableness any war of either ancient or modern times. Governments in those days, when making preparations to attack an enemy, never complained of *his* disliking them. They never said they were going to kill him and lay waste his territory because he hated them, but because they hated him. They fought him for their own satisfaction, not for his moral elevation. "If I know myself," said one of Nelson's Englishmen, "I have no prejudices, but I do hate a Frenchman." It was his hatred of Frenchmen which kept him to his guns at Trafalgar, not a desire to make Frenchmen love him.

In short, the only evil we can remedy by a war with Chili is, if any, Chili's ignorance of our resources and of our formidableness as an armed antagonist. That any such ignorance exists among the governing class in Chili, no sensible man who knows anything of the country will believe. Our "honor," in the duelling sense, can hardly be involved, because no intelligent Chilian doubts our military courage. For Chilian hostility, as for the hostility of any civilized man, or body of men, the remedy is kindness and consideration. For the death of the sailors the remedy is some compensation to their families and to the wounded. But to prevent this being ridiculous it ought to be obtained by peaceable means. To get it by war is like spending $1,000 at law for the recovery of $5. That we could, in the presence of the armaments supported by sea and land by European Powers, gain any glory or a high position as a military bully by fighting Chili, is something which no intelligent man will affirm. Our fame in the international arena is to be maintained, as it has been acquired, by our success in getting what we want without the use of force. It is in this we show our civilization and our modernness, if we may use the term. Tamerlane gained his ends by cutting throats. We should gain ours by assuming that all our civilized neighbors are friendly and are amenable to reason, and are willing to right an unprovoked wrong when it is properly described to them. For this process hardly any delay is too long. Not a gun or ship should be moved until the powers of persuasion have been wholly exhausted in the estimation, not of naval and military men, but of the wisest, most peace-loving and right-doing portion of the community. The one thing an American statesman should keep foremost in his mind is that he can go to war at any time, but, the war once begun, he never can tell beforehand at what time he can make peace. "Immediate satisfaction, sir," or, "A written apolo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gy, damn him," are duellists' phrases, not those of a politician. We can fight Chili a year hence as well as next month, and a year hence we may be sure we shall all see more clearly than we do now the merits of this quarrel. We waited seven years for the settlement of the *Alabama* claims, but they *were* settled without any naval fuming, and they cost no man's life, destroyed no man's home or property, and left our relations with Great Britain, as every one admits, better than they had been for three quarters of a century.

MR. SAXTON'S NEW CORRUPT-PRACTICES ACT.

SENATOR SAXTON has introduced his bill for the amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act, passed in 1890, and the changes which he proposes are of such importance as to amount practically to a new measure. He has made a careful study of the other laws and bills of the kind which have been considered in other American legislatures, and has embodied all their most desirable features in his amendments. The result is a far more comprehensive and stringent act against the corrupt and extravagant use of money in elections than has yet appeared in any part of this country. While it draws its leading principles from the English act of 1883, the application of those principles is adapted to American election methods.

The chief defects of the Act of 1890 were its failure to include campaign committees in the requirement for sworn publication of all expenditures of the election, and its failure to place limits to the expenditures of candidates. These defects Senator Saxton has remedied, and he has also provided against new abuses which were revealed in the last election. He has amended the provision which forbids any person directly or indirectly to use undue influence upon any voter in an election so as to make it include primaries, caucuses, and conventions, and to include also the offence of hiring a voter to refrain from registering. It is made a misdemeanor for any one to hire a voter to refrain from registering, or for any one to allow himself to be hired to so refrain. Both parties have charged that many voters were hired to stay away from the polls at the last election, and that many others were hired to withhold their names from the registry. The former method of bribing is forbidden by the present law, but nobody has ever tried to have the penalty enforced. The latter method was an invention of the last campaign, and furnishes the briber with a sure proof that the man he has bribed has kept his bargain in the absence of the latter's name from the registration lists.

Three new sections are proposed by Mr. Saxton, all of the highest importance. The first provides a maximum limit, not yet fixed, to the expenditures of all candidates, graded according to the importance of the office, and declares that "no candidate for judicial office shall pay or contribute directly or indirectly to any person, corporation, or political committee any sum or amount whatever, in money or its equivalent or other valuable thing, in aid of his nomination or election, or in aid of the nomination or election of any other candidate for office, or for campaign purposes, or to promote the success of a party ticket," and forbids any person, corporation, or political committee to ask or receive any contribution from a judicial candidate. This is a most desirable provision, and if enacted, it will put a stop to the practical sale of judicial nominations which Tammany has been making in this city for many years. No candidate for the bench can hope to receive the Tammany nomination unless he pay over from $5,000 to $25,000 to Tammany as the price of it. The surer he is of election after the nomination, the higher is the price levied, for the certainty of election enhances the value of the nomination.

The second new section proposed by Senator Saxton defines the lawful and unlawful uses which candidates may make of money, as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for a candidate for public office to pay, use, expend or contribute directly or indirectly any money or its equivalent or other valuable thing in aid of his nomination or election, or for any person, corporation, or political committee, to pay, use, expend or contribute directly or indirectly any money or its equivalent or other valuable thing in aid of the nomination or the election of such candidate, or for campaign expenses, or to promote the success of a party ticket except for the following purposes:

"(1.) The personal expenses of the candidate for travelling, postage, stationery, and clerk hire.

"(2.) Necessary committee and campaign-club expenses for rent, furniture, clerk hire, postage, and stationery.

"(3.) Necessary expenses of printing posters for use at public elections, unofficial ballots when they are required, and ballots for primary elections, caucuses, and conventions.

"(4.) Reasonable compensation for the services of watchers authorized by law at polling-places and places of holding primary elections and caucuses.

"(5.) Necessary expenses of printing and advertising, including the circulation of newspapers and the publication and distribution of pamphlets, circulars, addresses, and notices.

"(6.) A reasonable compensation to one person in each election district for making a canvass of voters.

"(7.) The necessary expenses of conveying poor and infirm voters to the polling places, and places of holding primary elections, caucuses, and conventions; but this shall not authorize the payment of any money or other valuable thing to such poor and infirm voter, or to any person as a compensation for procuring the attendance of such voter at the polls or place of holding the primary election, caucus, or convention.

"(8.) The necessary expenses for holding public meetings and conventions.

"(9.) The necessary expenses for providing uniforms and other paraphernalia for political clubs and music for street parades."

These provisions would be susceptible of gross abuse were they not coupled with the maximum limit to expenditures. Mr. Saxton, in addition to placing such limit, has drawn amendments to the section requiring sworn publication of expenses by candidates, which seem well calculated to prevent evasions similar to those which nearly all candidates committed in their statements after the last campaign. As amended, the section requires each candidate to file "an itemized statement showing in detail all the moneys which he has directly or indirectly, by himself or through any other person, paid or expended, or promised to contribute, pay, or expend, in aid of his nomination or election, or in aid of the nomination or election of any other person, or for campaign purposes, or to promote the success of a party ticket."

The third new section provides that "every political committee which aids in the nomination, election, or defeat of any candidate for public office, or assists in conducting a political campaign, or in promoting the success of the ticket of a political party, shall have a treasurer, and cause to be kept by him detailed accounts of all the money, securities, and equivalents of money received by or promised to such committee, and of the manner in which the same has been expended, and of all payments, liabilities, or promises of payment made by such committee, or any member thereof," and publish the same under oath after election. Any person not a member of such committee, or any person who is a member, who collects or disburses money in an election, or incurs liabilities to an amount exceeding five dollars, comes within the scope of this requirement.

The penalties for violation of the law remain the same as under the present act, with the exception that, in addition to imprisonment and loss of any office to which he may have been elected, a candidate convicted of any offence is disqualified for holding any kind of public office for five years.

REGISTRATION OF COPYRIGHT IN ENGLAND.

IN the development of legislation for the protection of literary and artistic property, there has been a noticeable tendency to make the statutory requirements for the securing and identifying of the copyright as little burdensome to the author or his assigns as possible. This has also been marked in the case of international agreements, and when the International Literary Property Convention was entered into, in 1887, after preliminary discussion of this point, it was agreed that an author, in order to secure full control of his copyright in the various countries of the Union, need only fulfil the conditions and formalities prescribed by law in his own country. But in England the law as to the registration of copyright and the deposit of copies is contained in what the *Law Quarterly Review* terms an "'ungodly jumble' of statutes and orders in council," and is decidedly complicated, and a recent English decision has added to the perplexing and unsatisfactory state of the law.

The case of Fishburn vs. Hollingshead, briefly stated, was as follows: The proprietors of a panorama of "Jerusalem and the Crucifixion of Christ," painted by a Munich artist and copyrighted in Germany, assigned to the plaintiffs the copyright of the picture in the United King-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom. The defendant attempted to exhibit a copy of the picture in London, and the questions for the determination of the court were, first, whether the panorama exhibited by Hollingshead was an infringement of the plaintiffs' copyright; secondly, whether the plaintiffs had secured the right to sue for an injunction, and, incidental to this last, whether registration in London is essential to the right to defend a foreigner's English copyright against infringement—a point of direct interest to all foreign authors who wish to obtain a valid copyright in Great Britain. The case was decided on February 4, 1891, and is reported in the Law Reports, 1891: Chancery Division, vol. ii., pp. 371–385. Mr. Justice Stirling, who rendered the decision, enters into an elaborate review of the stipulations as to registration contained in the various Copyright Statutes and Orders in Council, and arrives at the conclusion that, under the so-called International Copyright Acts, registration is not necessary unless distinctly provided for in the Order in Council under which aliens become the beneficiaries of the English copyright laws. But, to quote his own words, "Unless there is something in the Order which excepts the enactments with respect to registration contained in the General Copyright Acts, it seems to me that they must apply, and I have found nothing in the Convention or in the Order which makes any exception." In effect, the copyright proprietor must register in order to have the right to sue for the purpose of protecting his copyright property, and this because, "Unless express provision is made by the Order in Council for excepting from its operation some of its enactments, foreigners who claim copyright under the act are to be subject to the same obligations as are imposed by the statutes on British subjects"; and a passage from a decision by Lord Hatherley is quoted to show that if this were not so, "authors of foreign works would be placed in a better position than authors in this country, which certainly was not intended."

This reasoning seems not only narrow, but illogical, for under the operation of the Berne Convention, which requires of an author but one registration of his copyright for all the countries of the International Copyright Union, the English author loses nothing by the foreigner's exemption from registration in England, as he is given the reciprocal advantage of the remission of registration and deposit in all the countries of the Union except his own. Moreover, if each country of the Union should require a repetition of the registration and deposit in order to the securing of copyright within its own borders, the stipulation would be a very burdensome one. England's own plenipotentiaries, in their report on the Berne treaty, emphasize this, and say: "The only principle upon which an International Copyright Union can apparently be founded with any chance of success, is that the title to copyright shall be acquired in all States of the Union by the simple accomplishment of the formalities required by law in the country of origin."

In a note in the *Law Quarterly Review* for January, signed with the initials "T. E. S." (which we may safely assume stand for Thomas Edward Scrutton, author of 'The Law of Copyright,' 1883, second edition, 1890), British subjects are cautioned against republishing foreign literary or artistic works in England which they do not find registered at Stationers' Hall on the strength of the above case, as the learned Judge's opinion was clearly *obiter dictum*, he having decided that the work infringed had been properly registered. Mr. Scrutton briefly summarizes the various statutory provisions as to registration, and agrees that by reason of section 4 of the Act of 1886 the stipulations as to registry and delivery of copies do not apply to foreign works; but he contends that the provisions of the Act of 1844, instead of supplementing, superseded those of the Act of 1842, and that the Act of 1886 in turn superseded the Act of 1844, so that the new statutes do not revive the old provisions, but leave the foreign author to register in his own country, obtaining thereby copyright, by virtue of the International Convention, in all the countries of the International Union. We may add, as regards American authors who wish to obtain a valid copyright in England, that it would seem quite clear that their only safe plan is not only to register their claim of copyright, but also to deposit the five copies demanded by the English Copyright Law.

THE ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS.—I.

PARIS, January 7, 1892.

EACH of our Academies has what is called a Perpetual Secretary. Perpetual goes well with the name of Immortals, which is often applied, sometimes ironically, to the members of the French Academy of Letters. There is an Academy of Fine Arts, some members of which are as illustrious as the best-known members of the Academy of Letters. Our best sculptors, our best painters, our best musicians consider it an honor to be members of it. I will name for the present only Gounod, Meissonier, Gérôme, Paul Dubois, Bonnat, Baudry. This Academy of Fine Arts formed for nearly a century one of the divisions of the Institute of France, but for many years after its foundation (1795) it had no well-defined character or function. Its history has recently been written by Count Henri Delaborde, who is now its Perpetual Secretary.

Till the Revolution the "Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture" could receive an unlimited number of members. It opened liberally its doors to all the notable artists, to women as well as to men; Mme. Vigée-Lebrun, the admirable portrait-painter of all the great ladies during the reign of Louis XVI., was a member of it, as well as thirteen other ladies, now forgotten. Among the members of this old company we find such names as Lebrun, Lesueur, Watteau, David; great amateurs like Mariette, archæologues like Caylus and Choiseul-Gouffier. After 1789, David turned against his colleagues, and referred to the Academy as another Bastille which should be demolished. In a memorial signed by him and twelve of his friends, he put this question: "Is it tolerable that an autocratic and permanent tribunal should receive, place, judge eminent artists?" In the name of liberty the Royal Academy was suppressed, though its statutes were conceived in a very liberal spirit and its doors opened to all. The action of David is all the more remarkable because he was not an envious, mediocre, unsuccessful artist, but a painter of immense and recognized talent.

The Convention suppressed all the academies, but in this respect its work was ephemeral; as soon as the revolutionary tide subsided, the Institute was founded by the efforts of Lakanal, Grégoire, and others. A division was reserved for "literature and the fine arts," a sort of Janus-like class, which received the writers as well as the artists; and this third division of the Institute was subdivided into eight sections, four for writers and savants, four for artists. These latter four went under the names of "painting, sculpture, architecture, music and declamation." Among the twenty-four members who filled these four sections, we find David, Houdon the sculptor, the musicians Méhul and Grétry. Who can go to the Théâtre-Français without admiring the sitting statue of Voltaire—the masterpiece of Houdon? He is well known also for his Diana, now in the museum of the Louvre, his busts of Franklin, Diderot, etc. Méhul is the author of an opera, "Joseph," which has great beauties, and of the celebrated "Chant du Départ," a second sort of "Marseillaise." Grétry had won a great reputation many years before.

The division of the classes of the Institute into sections still subsists, though the classes themselves have been reorganized. It sometimes puts great difficulties in the way of the best candidates; the members of some sections are too "immortal" at times, and will not give way to extraordinary rising men. In the Academy of Sciences, for instance, Élie de Beaumont, who was one of the fathers of modern geology, had to be elected in the section of astronomy. The number of the members was limited in the new organization, which was in this respect less liberal than the organization of the old "Royal Academy." The division into sections has another inconvenience: it makes a sort of Procrustean bed, in which it is sometimes difficult to find a place; it does not take into account, in the Academy of Science, the development of new sciences, in the Academy of Fine Arts, the composite character of many an artist; it lacks elasticity and pliability.

After the *coup d'état* of Fructidor, 1797, five of the members of the new Institute were proscribed. La Réveillère-Lepeaux, who was himself a member of the Institute, was among the proscribers. General Bonaparte took the place left empty by Carnot. After the campaigns of Italy there, was much discussion about the statues and pictures which Bonaparte wished to send to France. Quatremère de Quincy had the courage to say that the great works of art ought not to follow the fortune of war and of revolution; they were not common plunder, and ought to remain in the places for which they were made. Bonaparte and the Directors had decided otherwise; they intended to "make of Paris the universal museum of France and of Europe." To do justice to the French artists, eight members of the third class of the Institute (and David was among them) signed, with forty-three other artists, a petition to the Directory, in which they expressed their desire that the monuments of antiquity should not be removed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Rome. Their wish was not regarded, and soon afterwards the Parisians had the amusement of a great fête given by the Directory (July 27, 1798) to celebrate the arrival of the colossal bronze horses of Venice, and a number of monuments, as well as plants and animals for the Jardin des Plantes, even lions, camels, and dromedaries, taken from the neighborhood of Pisa, immense carts full of books, manuscripts, and medals. Among the great monuments of art which had been *ceded* by the Pontifical Government were the Apollo Belvedere, the Laöcoon, the Dying Gladiator, the Virgin of Foligno, and the Transfiguration of Raphael, a number of pictures by Titian, Correggio, and Veronese. Few thought at the time that France was receiving all these objects only as a sort of deposit, and that a few years afterwards they would all return to Italy. I, for one, do not agree with Béranger, who protested in 1815 against the restitutions made by France, and "le vol fait par les rois."

The Institute was reorganized in 1803; the class of literature and fine arts was divided into two classes, one of which—the class of the fine arts—formed the fourth section of the Institute. An "arrête" of the Consuls determined the costume of the members of the Institute, a costume which has never been changed since. In all the sittings of the Institute we can admire what Arago called his "habit de perroquet" as the black coat—*la française*—is covered with embroidered green leaves of laurel. The Institute was transferred from the Louvre, where it sat at first, to the ancient college "des quatre nations," or Collège Mazarin. All the solemn sittings of the Institute take place in this building under the cupola which is familiar to all Parisians. Napoleon, when he became Emperor, founded, by a decree, great prizes, which were to be distributed by the Institute for the best works produced in science, letters, and arts.

Under the Restoration the fourth class of the Institute received its present name of Academy of Fine Arts. A class was created in it for "Académiciens libres"; this class was destined for distinguished amateurs, patrons of art, men who were not professional artists. There is, besides corresponding members, a class of members who are mostly foreigners. When the Academy of Fine Arts in 1816 received its definitive organization, we find among its members Houdon, Méhul, Denon, Gérard, Gros, Carle Vernet; the name of David does not figure on the list. David was one of "those regicides who had given their adherence to the *acte additionel* of April 22, 1815, accepted office from the usurper, and thus shown themselves irreconcilable enemies of France and of the Legitimate Government." These men had been condemned to perpetual banishment. David went to Decazes and asked for a passport. The Minister told him to remain. "This law is not made for you, M. David. The King does not intend to deprive France of the man who holds the sceptre of art. Stay in Paris; I promise you all security." David resisted these entreaties, and left for Brussels, where he died December 29, 1825. Louis XVIII. not only gave its final organization to the Academy of Fine Arts, he also was the real founder of the École des Beaux-Arts: the buildings of this new École, some of which are very remarkable, were, however, only finished by Duban under Louis Philippe. These buildings have even in our days received a great extension. Since 1824 it may be said that, notwithstanding several revolutions, the Academy of Fine Arts has always remained the same. Its constitution may be criticised—it is every day criticised by the young artists; but it has stood the test of time, and, with the École des Beaux-Arts and the École de Rome, which live, so to speak, under its patronage, has succeeded in giving to France a noble phalanx of great artists, some of whom have become world-famous.

During the reign of Charles X. the Academy opened its doors to Horace Vernet, to David d'Angers, to Ingres; at the very moment when Ingres was elected, the Academy, having to choose a musician as Académicien Libre out of a list of three candidates, chose Father Mattei, who was a good contrapuntist and had given lessons to Rossini, in preference to Beethoven. The great quarrel between the classicists and the romanticists filled the reign of Charles X., and had, of course, its echo in the Academy. The Academy became one of the favorite objects of the criticisms of the young school; its members were accused, many of them not unjustly, of a servile imitation of ancient forms and of an unjust contempt for nature. The romanticists studied life in living objects; they had men of great genius in their ranks, they despised tradition in every form of art.

The struggle continued under Louis Philippe; the romanticists found a strong ally in the eldest son of the King, the Duc d'Orléans, who encouraged rising artists and visited their studios; he bought for his gallery the "Stratonice" of Ingres and the "Assassination of the Duc de Guise" (both pictures are now in the galleries of the Duc d'Aumale at Chantilly). The King himself was more of a politician than an artist; he was fond of building, but was not happy in the choice of his architects. His children were almost all passionate for art, especially the Prince de Joinville, the Duc d'Aumale, and the Duc de Montpensier. Louis Philippe, however, much encouraged a great artist, Horace Vernet; it was because Vernet was an admirable painter of battles and helped the King in his splendid work of the restoration of the Palace of Versailles, which Louis Philippe intended to become a sort of illustration of the history of France. The historical galleries of the Palace of Versailles are now a monument of the greatest importance. Versailles gives to the visitor the best lesson in French history that can be given. Horace Vernet was a great favorite of Louis Philippe, who made him Director of the Academy of France at Rome, a post much envied, and very naturally envied, by all our artists.

COMMON SENSE IN NATIONAL ART GALLERIES.—II.

London, January, 1892.

The English has been one of the first national galleries to outgrow the period of fetishism. Even the Louvre, the Pitti, the Uffizi are centuries behind it in this respect; while in the Berlin Old Museum want of judgment in the selection and retention of pictures is as conspicuous as in the Dresden Zwinger. Indeed, the Berlin gallery has much the same good and bad points as the Dresden. It, too, is delightful in the plan of the building and arrangement of the rooms; by far the best impression being made when one enters from the Lustgarten, up the great stairway, into the Rotunda. Here the Raphael tapestries are more effective than in Dresden, though there is no difference in the hanging; but in Berlin the Rotunda serves as a palatial entrance hall, while in Dresden it merely cuts in two the line of long galleries. It may be a trifling matter to notice, but the care of the management is extended to the curtains, drawn in turn over each of the tapestries as the sunlight falls upon it from the cupola above, so that, though one or two or more may be covered, a few can be seen at all hours of the day. In the little room beyond leading to the passage to the new museum, beautiful old woodwork and bits of old church decoration adorn the walls; but in the galleries themselves decoration is of secondary importance to the pictures, as it should be. One might suggest, however, that the number of the room or the name of the school to which it is devoted, as in Vienna or London, would be more appropriate over the doors than gorgeous drapery. The light throughout, except in the narrow passages where pictures ought not to be, is good.

As in Dresden, pictures are arranged chronologically and according to schools, but with more thorough system and therefore with more satisfactory results. There is the same overflow into the cabinets, but these are fewer in number, while in them the order of periods and countries is more carefully observed. There may be many canvases which it ought to be the first duty of directors to get rid of, but, perhaps because the old masters of the Raczynski collection are in the National Gallery—more probably because there are really not so many—their numbers are less aggressive than in the Zwinger. It is now the guide-book platitude to say of Berlin that, if it has few masterpieces, its great merit is its historical completeness. But the best-ordered guide-book could not make good the first half of this platitude in comparing Berlin to Dresden. The Holbein at Berlin, the portrait of Gisze, with its simply marvellous detail, is no light rival to the "Morette" of Dresden. The little Crucifixion on the screen, the Bernard Van Orley, in the same collection are of minor interest by the side of the Berlin portraits of Moffel and Holzschuher, which make one wonder if perhaps Dürer may not have been a painter after all. The Ter Borchs of Dresden are not more Whistlerian and masterly, not better witnesses of the fact that in art as in literature there is nothing new, even in this very modern nineteenth century, than the luminous, harmonious little portraits which, if Ter Borch had painted them to-day, the world would call slavish imitations of Whistler. And what is there in Dresden finer than the deservedly famous Hille Bobbe of Franz Hals—the fishwife appears with much less success in the Dresden version—than his "Nurse and Child"? But to take one last supreme example, for it would be worse than useless to write a catalogue, what Sistine Madonna, what Rubens allegory, what Dutch or Flemish microscopic masterpiece, can approach the incomparable General Borro of Velasquez, the huge fat man, the Spanish Falstaff, ugly, gross, sensual, but, because he is alive on the canvas, a genuine man of unmistakable individuality and character? Because of the painter's achievement, he will be remembered when the great multitude of conventionally pretty ladies and conventionally fine gentlemen by Rubens and Van Dyck fade into one mental composite photograph, blurred and indistinct. This Velasquez is the great glory of the Berlin collection.

The other contention, that the Prussian gallery is the more historically complete of the two, is true enough. At Berlin there is no undue predominance of any one school or period, while the Italians and Spaniards are far more adequately represented, though there may be fewer examples of one or two individual artists. But in historical value the Berlin Museum cannot compete with the London National Gal-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lery. In the latter, the student not only follows quite as well the development of the art of painting throughout the centuries and in all countries, but he is shown some of the best results of this development in every period, and is spared much of the usual trash not yet swept from Berlin. There is hardly a school whose greatest master cannot be seen in at least one of his greatest pictures in London. But this cannot always be said of Berlin, while as a rule the Berlin masterpieces are eclipsed by those of London. To prove the truth of this assertion, take two or three of the most famous Italians, since it is impossible to go through the entire list. There is not one of the seven Botticellis, beautiful though the Virgin and Child surrounded by torch-bearing, flower-laden angels may be, which is as truly characteristic and full of Botticelli's decorative charm as that London Madonna, with the angels, in the circular frame. Fine as are two of the Titian portraits (Admiral Moro in the delightfully rendered armor, and the nameless young man in black and gold), the "Bacchus and Ariadne" is infinitely finer. And even Moroni's stunning portrait of himself against the beautiful greenish background must yield the palm to his unrivalled "Tailor."

It must be granted that with some of the lesser masters Berlin holds its own. It is there, and not in London, that you learn how well such men as Bronzino and Pollaiuolo could sometimes paint, while Giorgione's color could not be more gorgeous than in the Venetian youth arrayed in royal purple, with hair hanging straight over his ears and around his face. These, however, are exceptions. There are many Rembrandts at Berlin—too many, for every canvas the master signed is not a genuine Rembrandt in the artistic sense, and not the distinction of a star and Baedeker's borrowed dogmatism can make a picture like the "Susannah" one of his greatest and most mature productions. But even the "Saskia" and "Hendrickje Stoffels," which the artist, guide- and catalogueless, will find at once, would scarce be a fair exchange for the portraits of the old lady and himself in Trafalgar Square. Indeed, I think it doubtful if one would give up Franz Hals's young man in the same collection for the more famous "Hille Bobbe." The Lorraines and Poussins, too, are finer in London. And when it comes to the English school, no question of comparison can arise—there is no English work in Berlin; there is next to none anywhere on the Continent.

But to go further into detail would be to vie with Baedeker or the author of that prize puzzle, the Berlin Catalogue. I aim at nothing more ambitious than to point out what struck me as the chief characteristics, good and bad, of the Berlin Old Museum. The next visitor probably will differ from me; so much the better if he but base his opinions on his own observation, and not on ready-made cheap criticism. To pretend that directors should be influenced by the fancies of any and every one who goes through their galleries would be sheer nonsense. But if we defer to the literary man in questions of literature, the artist certainly should be thought competent to judge in matters of art; and one fact upon which all artists will agree is, that the sale value of a picture lies in its artistic qualities. Judged by this standard, the collection of Berlin would be no less improved by the judicious removal of scores of wholly valueless canvases now disfiguring the walls than that of Dresden. London has shown, in a measure, how this can be done. The great trouble at the present day is that directors are not artists, and that galleries which should be held sacred as legacies for artists and art students, are run for the amusement of the tourist. If a gallery is of no use to an artist, it is of no value whatever. Now that art is on the town, however, only the Young Person, whether from England or America, is considered.

The Old Pinakothek of Munich is, next to the Louvre, the gallery which the modern artist knows best, since nowadays the student who does not go to Paris is almost sure to study in Munich. And in the Old Pinakothek, while he would be the last to complain if a hundred years ago the French had made a clean sweep of second-rate masterpieces not thought of sufficient importance to be reclaimed, still the pictures of absolutely no use to him are not so aggressively conspicuous. In the first place, there are about half the number of canvases of which Dresden boasts; in the second, the historical arrangement is more perfectly carried out and the hanging better than in Berlin, so that the impression made is less confusing. If architecturally the building may not be as striking, the galleries themselves are as well designed, as well lighted, and as well decorated as those of Dresden and Berlin, and my experience is that they are less exhausting physically and mentally, which is no small test of their power to interest. The great work is seen to advantage; the careful historical sequence observed helps to reconcile one here more than elsewhere to the survival of much that is bad and more that is commonplace. Certainly there seems better reason in Munich for the honors invariably paid to the primitives, chiefly because one begins at the beginning, walking at once into the rooms devoted to early German and Netherlandish schools, instead of coming upon them after looking at the work of abler draughtsmen and painters of greater artistic breadth; partly because of the excellence of many of these primitives.

There is always more or less of the conventional in art, but necessarily it must be more when the convention does not originate with the painter, but is forced upon him by social or religious influences, as it was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But, hampered as he then was by his patrons in the Church, and immature as were his methods and knowledge, he could always show his artistic feeling and scope by the individual decorative quality he gave to the treatment of the motives he shared with all artists. It was not his shortcomings and his unavoidable defects that made him an artist, as a modern primitive like Holman Hunt seems to think. But the latter has not worked in vain, for, to compare his affected imitation of the earlier painters' defects, devoid of their compensating beauty, with the delightfully decorative altar-pieces, sincere in their crude draughtsmanship and perspective and conventional composition, by unknown Cologne masters, by mere copyists of Van Eyck, or by such men as Burgkmair and Wolgemut, as one sees them at Munich, is to understand more fully wherein they excelled. As a rule, however, the large church panels and triptychs exhibited out of their proper place serve but to confirm the fact, if confirmation were needed, that a picture-gallery is the most artless of inventions. Perhaps I was specially struck with this in Munich because I had just come from Schwabach, a town occupying too little space in Baedeker to attract many tourists from near Nuremberg, but where there is an old church with a marvellous altar-piece by Wolgemut, which, seen where he intended it should be seen, is twice or three times as effective as his "Resurrection" in the Old Pinakothek, though the latter may have held its own before it was taken from the altar at Hof.

But, on the whole, in Munich, the lesser-known earlier men suffer less than the more famous painters, whose work illustrates a still more inartistic tendency of the modern picture gallery—that is, to preserve and lend undue importance to canvases which can add nothing to the reputation of the artist, and at times must detract from it. To those who know something about art and can think for themselves, it is evident that too many of the Dürers, if they are really his, are but pot-boilers (I am not sure that I would except even the portrait of himself over which every well-informed visitor goes into the correct ecstasy); that the two Holbeins are to be counted among this painter's failures; that the one Franz Hals and the greater number of the Rembrandts can but remind one how very uneven both were in their work (it is only fair to remember, however, that the genuineness of the former's "Group of Family Portraits" has been questioned); and that a couple of Van der Werffs or Breughels, of Teniersen or even Ruysdaels, would have more than satisfied the reasonable man.

This may sound very like heresy. It is easier to be orthodox where Rubens is concerned. I remember once being in Venice when a group of young students from Munich came there to see its art treasures, and went back quickly, scoffing at Titian and Tintoretto and Veronese. "They would rather have Rubens every time," was their verdict, more candid than elegant. And though not to be endorsed unconditionally, it must be acknowledged that in Munich the genius of Rubens asserts itself most powerfully, and that the Old Pinakothek calls, less than any other gallery, for a wholesale reduction in the wall space devoted to the productions of his workshop. Rubens himself is seen rather than the pupils and assistants who did too much of his work for him. One recognizes not only the touch of the master, but the master's study of problems not to be solved by the conventions and traditions of the schools. Here are, not the St. Jeromes thrown off to meet the expenses of an Antwerp palace, but Christs and angels and other stock Scriptural subjects treated as means to a great decorative end; here are the smaller sketches, vigorous, rich, suggestive as the Dresden studies; here the satyrs which have since given inspiration to Böcklin, and here, too, portraits almost as fresh and clean as a good Franz Hals—"ripping," is what the artist calls his "Doctor Van Thulden"—and an astonishing landscape, with a rainbow, like a Constable in composition and color-scheme, though naturally not in treatment. Rubens painted so often simply to fill orders that it is a delight to find him, as in Munich, painting for his own pleasure. But how difficult it was for him to preserve his independence has a curious illustration in his portrait of Philip IV. of Spain, whose face Velasquez has made as familiar as that of any public man of to-day, but whose main characteristics Rubens has toned down, whose face he has sweetened, not daring to look at royalty with eyes free from the spectacles of convention or to represent it with the unflinching realism of Velasquez.

The preëminence of Rubens may be partly due to the poverty of the Italian sections, for Munich has but few fine canvases of Italian masters, none of those Venetians who rival him in decorative splendor. Nor can he lose by comparison with the Spaniards. The two Ve-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lasquezes are interesting necessarily—Velasquez could paint nothing that was not of interest; but they do not reach the standard of the "General Borro" in Berlin, of the "Philip" in London; while the Murillos, though popular, owing to the many engravings from them, and though all well-read American young ladies would call them sweet, are but prototypes of to-day's sentimental picture that tells a story. Rubens's competitors in Munich are his own countrymen. The painters who, after him, support the Old Pinakothek's claim to rank with the great galleries of the world, are the Fleming of his own age—Van Dyck, who not often is so free from conventionality, so much readier to paint his sitters as they looked to him than as they would have liked him to fancy them; Snyders, Boel, Fyt, De Vos—men whose work is never very interesting, but who are seen at their best here.

The directors at Munich have known not only how to classify and hang their pictures, but how to catalogue them, and a good catalogue is not made every day. In it the pictures are placed and numbered as on the walls; to pass from one to the next does not mean to turn over a hundred and more pages in the book in your hand. Herr Bode has devoted, I believe, long months to the catalogues of the Berlin collections, and has received great credit for them; here the names of the painters are given alphabetically, there are indexes and references and every elaborate aid to the proper understanding of the system adopted—everything, in fact, but the one simple requirement, which is, that the picture should be as readily found in the catalogue as on the walls. In the Dresden catalogue the arrangement is according to schools and painters, which would be admirable if all the works of one school or of one man occurred together in the gallery also; but they do not, and confusion is the result. If catalogues are published and sold for the greater convenience of the student or visitor, simplicity should be the one and only end aimed at in their construction. As it is, the chief object seems to be to give evidence of the compiler's learning, so that, the more complicated they are, the more honor they reflect upon him. Whoever has gone from the Salon, with its alphabetical catalogue, to the Royal Academy, with its plain, straightforward list of contributions arranged in the exact order in which they hang, with an alphabetical index of artists' names following, can appreciate the relief of the Munich catalogue after those of Dresden and Berlin.

The Young Person, who knows beforehand what to see, what to admire, what to worship in every collection of pictures, has a soul above such trifles as a poor catalogue and a worse arranged gallery. But to the man to whom love of art does not mean loss of common sense, these are evils the more irritating because they might be so easily remedied were it not for modern superstition and sentiment. Honest criticism of long-established institutions is at times more wholesome than repetition of traditional praise. N. N.

Correspondence.

THE MILITARY POINT OF VIEW.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Whether we shall be justified or not in making war on Chili is a question not yet ripe for decision, depending, first, on full and accurate knowledge of what has really taken place; and, secondly, on what Chili may decide to do in the matter. But some of our public men are reported as having prejudged the question. Says Senator Kyle: "The sentiment of the people I represent is against any war with Chili. Such a contest would be a national disgrace. The bare idea of going to war with a country smaller than one of our States is criminally ludicrous" (Washington *Star* of January 19). Says Senator Peffer: "The statement that 60,000,000 of people—the biggest, richest, and most prosperous nation on earth—should entertain the idea of war with a little country like Chili, is an absurdity" (Washington *Star* of January 19). Other public men have been reported as insisting that the case is a proper one for arbitration; and others, again, have expressed the opinion that if Chili has instituted and completed a judicial inquiry into the facts according to her own forms of procedure, she has fulfilled her international obligations in the matter, and if the result shows that there is no just cause for our demand for reparation, we are bound by the decision.

Every one of these positions appears to me erroneous. According to the doctrine of Senators Peffer and Kyle, any nation much less powerful than our own has *carte blanche* to commit outrages upon our citizens without fear of being compelled to make reparation. In other words, American sailors cannot claim of their Government protection from outrages that may be committed on them in a port of a nation comparatively feeble—that is to say, in the far greater number of foreign countries.

As for a resort to arbitration, the objection is substantially the same. Would the United States Government dare to say to its sailors that, whether an outrage committed on them by some savage tribe, or in the port of some comparatively feeble nation, shall be atoned for or not, will depend on the decision—after proceedings more or less dilatory—of some foreign Government?

Finally, as to the result judicially arrived at in the country of which reparation is claimed being conclusive: such a doctrine has no shadow of foundation in international law. It means that, however overwhelming the evidence that the finding of facts by the foreign tribunal is contrary to the truth—whether owing to the perjury of witnesses, or the over-awing of officials by the populace, or their own hostile feelings—the complaining Government can have no redress.—Respectfully yours,

Francis J. Lippitt.

Washington, D. C., January 20, 1892.

[What would you do if the result of a judicial inquiry "showed there was no just cause for our demand for reparation"? Would you use your superior strength to exact reparation if the cause was unjust or inadequate? Surely not. Where did you get the notion that a civilized, Christian government did *not* fulfil its "international obligations," in case of outrages on foreigners on its soil, by a fair trial of the offenders according to the law of the land in which the offence was committed? Do you not know that this is a long-established principle and practice of international law, and was fully set out and adhered to and relied upon by us in our controversy with Italy over the New Orleans massacre? You surely do not suppose that Senator Peffer started it. International law offers no impunity either for small or for large States in case the trial is marked by manifest injustice. If it should be improperly conducted, however, and end in a failure of justice, there should be no greater display of resentment towards a small than a large State—in other words, no bullying. If the wrong be manifest, Chili ought to get no worse treatment than England. What you mean by your objection to arbitration we do not exactly know. In so far as we understand it, it applies to all trials of disputes before an impartial tribunal. Your interpretation, in the last paragraph, of the doctrine that the judicial findings of foreign tribunals in criminal acts committed within their jurisdiction are conclusive on all concerned, sounds so like burlesque that we pass it without remark. Nobody that we know of outside a lunatic asylum has put your construction on it.—Ed. Nation.]

ANGLOPHOBIA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Prophesying is dangerous work, and if three-score years have done nothing else, they have at least taught me wariness in this respect. But sometimes there comes the luxury of saying, "I told you so."

On first reading the plan of governing London by a County Council, I said that if that could be made to work successfully, I must either give up all my theories of administration, or assume that the human material in London was very different from anything in this country. Mr. R. B. Carter, a member of the Council, has written a letter to the *Times* declining reëlection and stating his views, upon which the *Spectator* comments as follows:

"London has no visible Executive Government. So far as such a function has been intrusted to the County Council, it is not performed by visible persons at all, but by nineteen ordinary and five special committees of varying numbers—one containing the preposterous number of sixty members—varying attendances, and varying methods of selection, some being filled up from political motives, some because competent men are indispensable, and some because certain Councillors given to fads are urgent to be placed on those committees. The Executive Government is, in fact, intrusted to minute or large but always changeable groups of Councillors, who may be competent and industrious or incompetent and lazy, but who make up in either case formless bodies of men, whose names, ideas, and work are all equally unknown to their constituents."

What follows has a familiar sound:

"But if the electors will not attend the polls, or are taken in by false professions, or suffer themselves to be 'jockeyed' in any way, they must consent to bear the consequences of their own indifference or silliness."

Reconsideration, however, comes later on:

"We accept democracy in fact, but that is no reason why democracy should choose for itself an absurd method of selecting the men who are to do its executive work. There is nothing democratic about a committee which a ministry does not share; or, rather, a committee is the least democratic of the two, because the democracy cannot watch it, does not know its character, and cannot either dismiss it or send it before a tribunal to be sentenced. A committee with the powers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be the least democratic and most inefficient authority on finance conceivable, and it is through such a body that the London Council in every department elects to work.

"Busy men will not enter the Council to be forced to sit on those secret committees, and the representation of London will gradually be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

left to idlers, to men whose trade is politics, and to men who hope indirectly to make money out of the position."

Of course, we have no cities organized on just this plan, but the argument is just as good for our boards and commissions, and for our Legislatures, both State and national. In this case, however, I will leave your readers to point the moral for themselves. G. B.

BOSTON, January 23, 1892.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL FORGERIES AT WYMAN, MICHIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Wyman, Mich., is a small village on the Stanton branch of the Detroit, Lansing and Northern Railroad, about sixty miles northwest of Lansing. It is in a region from which in recent years the pine woods have been cut away. Only a small portion of the land is under cultivation, and as the sawmills have been removed, the country presents a desolate appearance. The ground is covered with low, rounded elevations a few feet across, most of which were produced by the uprooting of trees in past times and the decaying of roots in the soil thrown up by them. Among these there are larger, sepulchral mounds of an aboriginal population, which yield human bones and a few neolithic remains of the common sort. The soil is sandy.

In October, 1890, a man digging postholes in a field near Wyman found a small cup of unbaked clay. In the spring and summer of 1891 other discoveries were made, and the inhabitants of the region passed into a state of great excitement, which has hardly yet subsided. In the enthusiasm for excavating, many hundreds of mounds and elevations were dug into. One man, while digging at a greater depth than usual, was caught and killed by the caving in of the sand at the sides of the pit. In a number of instances the excavations brought to light objects surprisingly unlike what might be expected from the archæological environment. The discoveries were made over an area three or four miles in diameter, the greater number within a mile and a half from Wyman; it is said that a few things have been found four or five miles distant. Some of the objects were taken from mounds, others from ground more nearly level, where no evidences of the former existence of mounds were apparent. The things unearthed lay at a depth varying from eighteen inches to three or four feet below the surface. They are nearly all of clay. The discoveries are attested by the number and credibility of the participants and witnesses, who in several instances have substantiated their statements by affidavits. That the objects were really taken from the ground as represented is beyond question. It is reported that some of the specimens were so connected with the roots of trees as to give the excavators the impression that they are of great antiquity.

The objects thus brought to light are numerous, and comprise a variety of classes. The most noteworthy are the cists, or caskets, of which it is said that about thirty have been found up to date. They are oblong, measuring from a foot to thirty inches in length, with a width of six to ten inches and height to correspond. The sides are generally covered with hieroglyphics and alphabetic characters drawn apparently from several ancient alphabets and stamped in the clay when soft. These signs sometimes run across the sides; in other cases they are grouped in panels. Several of the cists are adorned with human figures in rude outline; the circle and the pyramid are also favorite designs for decoration. The lids carry forms in heavy modelling. One has a city wall with towers and a high pylon. Another is embellished with a figure probably intended to represent a bull. Several have recumbent lions. One shows an upturned face, with an elaborate head-dress. No ashes were found in the cists; instead there were tablets and a few other objects. In one there were found fifteen of the stamps, or dies, of the characters stamped on the outside. The tablets from the cists, and those discovered by themselves, number perhaps seventy-five in all. They vary greatly in size and shape, most of them being of a size convenient for the hand. They are covered with characters like those of the cists. Besides these, a number of rude vases and smaller objects have been discovered. Among them are a few coins of copper beaten out thin, and adorned with various alphabetic signs. The weight of two coins which have been examined is suspiciously near that of our one-cent pieces.

Three or four archæologists have pronounced the relics forgeries; yet a considerable number of people believe in them, and are improving every opportunity to spread before the public information regarding the alleged marvellous discoveries. The favorite explanation is that these objects are the remains of a colony that in a remote period found its way to Michigan from the valley of the Tigris and Euphrates. As one writer naïvely remarks (in the *Christian Herald*): "They [the colony] must have left there in a period of remote antiquity. It must have been before the Exodus, for Moses speaks of the iron furnace and the iron bedstead of Og, King of Bashan. But these people used bronze or copper instead of iron, showing that the arts of iron were not known to them."

Three pieces, a sphinx, a vase, and a tablet, have recently come into the possession of the University of Michigan. They were taken from a low mound 150 rods northeast of Wyman. In view of the determined effort to palm off the Wyman finds as genuine, it was thought best to subject these specimens to a more than cursory examination, and to make public the results. The sphinx rests upon a thin base, fourteen inches long and six wide, rounded at the corners, and ornamented with a stamped figure repeated about the margin at the rear and sides; the figure is like a V followed by a circle. The sphinx itself measures about ten inches from throat to tail, and is six inches in height to the top of the head-dress, which hangs down on both sides, and is adorned with a figure like an arrow-head repeated in seven vertical rows. The modelling is crude in the extreme, particularly in the legs, haunches, and face. The maker has failed in just the point in which the primitive artist rarely fails, the emphasis of prominent features. In this respect the modelling is far inferior to the carving of the prehistoric stone pipes occasionally found in this State. It is the crude bungling of an unintelligent imitator, who had seen only pictures of a sphinx.

The vase, which might pass for an odd-shaped candlestick, has a flat circular base five inches in diameter. From the central portion two wings project in opposite directions. These measure eight inches between extreme points; the vessel is also eight inches high. The wings and body are ornamented with triangular stamped impressions. After these were made, a cloth was rubbed over them to remove the irregularities of the surface, leaving marks made by the texture.

The tablet is oblong, rounded at one end. It is four inches long at the edges, nearly five across (the centre), and three inches wide. It has the thickness of an inch at the square end, of half an inch at the other end. It was pressed in a frame of machine-sawed boards, as may be seen from the edges, which were not rubbed down enough to remove the impressions of the splinters. It is crowded with characters stamped close together. There were seven stamps used, which were so repeated as to give nineteen impressions on one side, twenty-four on the other, without any apparent relation to one another.

The material of the three pieces is a light-colored clay, containing a large percentage of drift sand. They were dried either in the sun or in contact with mild heat. In drying, the clay opened in cracks, the edges of which are sharp and fresh. The surface shows no traces of discoloration. Fragments of the clay dissolve immediately in water. In view of the perishable character of the material, the slight elevation of the mound, the nearness of the objects to the surface, and the amount of the yearly rainfall in this region, it is clear that the objects could not have been in the ground more than one year.

Here is evidence, then, of a deliberate and laborious attempt at imposition. There must have been a stronger motive than the mere desire to mystify people. Is this the work of an unbalanced religious fanatic, for whom some prophet will arise in due time and interpret the supposed mystic symbols into a new creed? More likely the fabrication is to be credited to a thorough villain, who has thought thus to palm off his crude work at a profit, and trifle with sacred human interests at the same time. On either supposition there is no reason why honest people should be deceived any longer as to the true character of these forgeries, or be misled by the fanciful interpretations of misguided enthusiasts. FRANCIS W. KELSEY.

ANN ARBOR, MICH., January 16, 1892.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In view of the wide publicity given to the report of the discovery of "Assyrian" antiquities in a Michigan mound, I beg of you to announce that the tablets and monuments claimed to have been excavated are wilful forgeries, remarkable only for their clumsy character and the great ignorance betrayed by the forger. Photographs of the objects have been sent me, and a glance is sufficient to reveal the true character of the "find." The inscriptions are largely a horrible mixture of Phœnician, Egyptian, and ancient Greek characters taken at random from a comparative table of alphabets such as is found at the back of Webster's Dictionary. As for the cuneiform characters found on some of the tablets, they are, in the main, variations of a single character which the forger happened to have stumbled across, perhaps in the article "Cuneiform" of Appletons' Encyclopædia, while the sculptures, which include a sphinx of an "Irish" cast of features, are evidently copied from some illustrated hand-book of archæology, or from illustrations in encyclopædic articles.

The purpose of the forger is also clear, for one of the tablets contains a pictorial representation of the "Deluge," divided into three sections—the catastrophe, the ark, and the exit of Noah, his family, and the animals out of the ark; all in conventional style, though very crude and awkward. Again, a number of the monuments have the traditional shape of the two Hebrew tablets of stone; and the numerals from one to ten on these tablets, indicated now by a series of dots and again by lines placed in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fanciful positions, clearly reveal the thought in the mind of the forger.

It is surprising that any sensible person should have been for one moment deceived by so evident a fraud, and yet a correspondent writes that there are fifty-seven affidavits in existence testifying to the genuineness of the discovery—just fifty-six more than there ought to be, for I am perfectly ready to accept the affidavit of the forger that he found underneath the ground what he had been careful to place there.—Very truly yours,

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, January 19, 1892.

WOMEN IN THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your Zürich correspondent has no doubt already informed you not only that women *may* become Privat-docenten at Zürich, but that, after due consideration of her trial lecture, the Faculty of that University has granted to Dr. Emilie Kempin the *venia legendi* for Roman, English, and American law. Another lady, a German, from Stuttgart, has recently taken her degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Zürich with so much distinction that there was no doubt of her rapidly passing on to a professorship. She decided, however, to modify her career by marrying a Zürich professor. The world moves so rapidly now in regard to the woman question that it is hard to keep pace with it. The sneer of the *Saturday Review*—"Who will be found to marry these learned women?"—sounds already as old-fashioned as a quotation from 'Evelina'; as this passage, for instance:

"'But I am a sad, weak creature; don't you think I am, my lord?'

"'O, by no means,' answered he; 'your ladyship is merely delicate; and devil take me if ever I had the least passion for an Amazon!'

"'I have the honor to be quite of your lordship's opinion,' said Mr. Lovel, 'for I have an insuperable aversion to strength, either of body or mind, in a female.'" X.

BOBBIN AND LATCH-STRING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The question raised by "W. H.W." in No. 1383 of the *Nation* with regard to "bobbin" and "latch-string" is an exceedingly interesting one, but information on the subject seems to be very hard to obtain. The lexicographical authorities within my reach have but one reference. Larousse and Littré quote the passage from Perrault, and the American and English dictionaries merely give a translation of this passage.

As to the mode of fastening the door in France by means of the *chevillette*, it can be shown to be 600 years old at least. Adenès le Roi, who lived and wrote in the latter part of the thirteenth century, uses *chevillette* as a door-fastener in one of his poems entitled "Cleomades." The hero, as he travels along, sees a magnificent castle, approaches and resolves to enter it. Then

"Les chevillettes si tourna
Que droit sour la tour aresta."

That is, he turned the pegs until he stopped right on the tower. That a method of fastening radically different from that of Perrault is here intended is evident from the two verbs *tourner* and *tirer*. And so in England and America we have used both these methods of fastening. Mary Howitt says in one of her poems:

"Our good old friend he tirled the pin,
He opened the door and entered in."

As for the latch-string, it is familiar to our rural denizens all over the country. One of the earliest recollections of my childhood is a leathern thong which hung outside our kitchen door, and which was always pulled in at night. Our negro "quarters" were also fastened in the same way; and this seems to have been the customary form of door-latch from a very early period of our history, as I remember to have read somewhere that some one of our colonial celebrities (possibly William Penn or Roger Williams) was in the habit of leaving his latch-string on the outside, both night and day, to show the Indians how completely he trusted them.

As regards the *turning* latch, we undoubtedly have its survival in our present door-knob. We now twirl the knob, and the latch springs back; but the direct descendant of the *chevillette* and *bobinette* was the lock in which, when the knob was turned, the latch was raised over the catch. This is still to be seen in some of our older houses.—Yours respectfully,

SAMUEL GARNER.

ANNAPOLIS, MD., January 20, 1892.

Notes.

MR. M. D. CONWAY'S 'Life of Thomas Paine' heads the list of forthcoming publications by the Messrs. Putnam. It will form two octavo volumes. Other announcements are the 'Writings of Thomas Jefferson,' edited by Paul Leicester Ford, in uniformity with the Hamilton, Franklin, Jay, and Washington; the 'Life of George Mason,' by Kate Mason Rowland; the fifth and concluding volume of Talleyrand's Memoirs; 'Primitive Man in Ohio,' by Warren K. Moorhead; a translation of the Marquis de Nadaillac's 'Customs and Monuments of Prehistoric Peoples'; the second of four volumes of Evelyn Abbott's 'History of Greece'; 'Outlines of Roman History,' by Prof. Henry F. Pelham of Oxford; 'Pagan Residuum in Christianity,' by Abram Herbert Lewis, D.D.; 'Walter Savage Landor,' a critical study, by Edward Waterman Evans, jr.; 'The Odes and Epodes of Horace,' translated into English verse beside the Latin text, by John B. Hague; 'The English Language and English Grammar,' by Samuel Ramsey; 'From Palm to Glacier,' travels in Brazil, Bermuda, and Alaska, by Mrs. Alice Wellington Rollins; 'Politics and Pen Pictures,' by the Hon. Henry W. Hilliard, of Georgia; and 'Three Hundred and Sixty-six Dinners,' by Mary E. Nicol.

D. Appleton & Co. are about to begin a Holland Fiction Series for the refreshment of jaded palates, the first number being 'Eline Vere,' by Louis Couperus, with an introduction by Edmund Gosse. They also announce 'Evolution in Science, Philosophy, and Art,' lectures before the Brooklyn Ethical Association by John Fiske and others; 'New Fragments,' scientific mostly, but with personal recollections of Carlyle, by Prof. Tyndall; 'The Horse: A Study in Natural History,' by Prof. W. H. Flower of the British Natural History Museum; and 'Moral Teachings of Science,' by Arabella B. Buckley.

Harper & Bros. will publish immediately 'Lyrics,' by the late Cora Fabbri; and 'The Marquis of Salisbury,' by H. D. Traill.

A translation of Prof. W. Windelhard's 'Geschichte der Philosophie' is in the press of Henry Holt & Co.

'Wagner as I Knew Him,' by the late Dr. Ferdinand Praeger, and a translation of the Abbé Fouard's 'St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity,' are nearly ready to be issued by the Messrs. Longman.

The Historical Printing Co., 97 Clark Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., is printing a limited edition of unpublished writings of men of the Revolution, under the title 'Fragments of Revolutionary History,' and editorship of Gaillard Hunt.

Sampson Low & Co., London, propose to publish by subscription a work on 'The History of Engraving in England,' edited by Louis Fagan of the British Museum, with 100 illustrations in photogravure.

The fifth volume of the new Cambridge Shakspere (Macmillan) contains "Henry VI.," "Richard III.," and "Henry VIII." In the preface, a new note discusses briefly the relation of the quarto and folio of "Richard III.," bringing the subject down to date and giving the authorities. We have already called attention, as each volume appeared, to the merits of this edition, and in particular to its adaptability for the library; but we cannot neglect any opportunity of repeating our commendation.

Mr. Oscar Browning contributes to the Dilettante Library two monographs on 'Dante' and 'Goethe' (Macmillan), being expansions of articles in the last edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' They do not aim at perfection beyond that natural to their original purpose, and are frankly biographical and bibliographical, without refinements of criticism or philosophy. They contain a sound and simple account of the lives and works of these authors, and indicate sufficiently well the typical place that each holds in culture and civilization. One seeking such an introduction cannot do better than consult these convenient handbooks.

Books in elucidation of Browning continue to fall from the press, and distinguished among the rest is a really excellent, if late-born, 'Primer' (Macmillan). The author, F. Mary Wilson, confines the introductory portion to a short sketch of Browning's life, and a somewhat longer one of his genius, more remarkable for frankness than for originality; the remainder, that is to say, four-fifths of the volume, is occupied with introductions to the separate poems, in which each is described and its relation to the philosophy of Browning, as understood by her, is set forth. The volume is the result of careful study, and unites with an admirable simplicity a very welcome freedom from obtrusive hero-worship.

An empty place among our anthologies is filled by 'Political Verse,' edited by George Saintsbury, in the Pocket Library (Macmillan). He begins with Skelton, but soon gets into the period of party government and makes the body of his volume out of the last two centuries. On the list we find Rochester, "The State Poems," Defoe, Prior, Glover, Churchill, the 'Rolliad,' Peter Pindar, the 'Anti-Jacobin,' Scott, Canning, Byron, and a great deal from Moore and Praed, besides extracts from Ebenezer Elliott, Mackay, Mansel, and more particularly Mr. H. D. Traill, for whose inclusion, in a work otherwise confined to writers not living, there is no excuse but friendship. The volume is curious rather than interesting, and is chiefly valuable for a few odds and ends, not easily come by, being usually confined to the library of the special literary student.

The series of attractive classics, beautifully printed and admirable in every point of the book-maker's art, now issuing as the Temple Library, adds to its previous volumes Goldsmith's 'Citizen of the World,' under the competent editorship of Austin Dobson (London:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan). Mr. Railton furnishes some small, pretty etchings, which distinctly add to the charm of the two volumes. Mr. Dobson finds the original suggestion of Goldsmith's work in a squib by Horace Walpole upon Admiral Byng's trial, and his theory in respect to the matter is certainly plausible. As to the body of the work, the editor emphasizes its principal interest as Goldsmith's commentary upon London, of which he was a good observer, and points out what it contains of the germs of Goldsmith's later works, particularly in the delineation of humorous characters forecasting the 'Vicar' and the comedies; he calls attention also to some passages which Goldsmith worked over and reproduced afterwards. It is to be hoped that this edition of a neglected work may serve to bring it forward as from the same hand, if not of the same rank, as more finished productions, and worthy of a more familiar place on the shelves of literary students than it has lately held.

Out of two series of Sunday lectures delivered at South Place Institute, London, during the past three years, has been made the volume 'Religious Systems of the World,' which comes to us in a second, revised and enlarged, edition from Macmillan. Brief sketches or expositions are given in Part I. of twenty-seven "Pre-Christian and non-Christian" religions—counting "The Religions of Ancient America" as one. Then comes like treatment of thirty-two "Christian, theistic, and philosophic" systems, including "The Religion of Dante," "Mysticism," "The Evolution Theory," "Secularism," etc. In Part I. the writers are nearly all recognized authorities in their several subjects, and their method is objective and critical; in the second part an advocate expounds each system, with sympathy as the resultant note too often, rather than impartiality. The book is necessarily fragmentary; but the collection and juxtaposition are curious, and the whole may be fairly said to merit the sub-title, "A Contribution to the Study of Comparative Religion."

'Argentina and the Argentines,' by Thomas A. Turner (Scribners), professes to be only "notes and impressions of a five years' sojourn in the Argentine Republic," yet it is a thoroughly readable and distinctly veracious and illuminating book. Without any comprehensive plan, the successive chapters give a good insight into the social, and particularly the political, life of Argentina, while the pages devoted to the period of mad financial legislation and insane speculation throw a great amount of light upon a catastrophe of which some competent hand ought to write the entire history. Occasionally one hears the genuine English snort of contempt for things not liked or understood; but, after all, this is only part of the author's personality which, on the whole, lends interest and pleasure to what he writes.

Under the title of 'A Conversation on Music,' we have received from C. F. Tretbar, Steinway Hall, an English version of Rubinstein's new book, reviewed in this journal two weeks ago. The translation, by Mrs. J. P. Morgan, can hardly be termed elegant or idiomatic, but it will give those who cannot read German or Russian a chance to study the "paradoxical opinions" of Rubinstein, as he himself calls them.

A volume on the 'Historic Storms of New England,' by Sidney Perley, comes from the Salem (Mass.) Press. It is a diligent compilation of accounts of violent gales and distressing wrecks, of floods, snows, and tornadoes, with liberal additions on yellow and dark days, comets and earthquakes. The book is distinctly historical, not meteorological, the greater part being narrative of the effects produced by the storms. The omission of all indication of the sources of information lessens the value of the work as a guide for further study. Although no quotation marks are used, the descriptions appear to be but little changed from ancient and modern records. The terminology adopted is not uniform, as hurricane, whirlwind, cyclone, and tornado are all applied to storms properly designated by the last of these names.

By order of the Grand Duke of Baden, all the universities of that principality have just been opened to women in the departments of science and mathematics. Women were already admitted as students in all departments at Freiburg and at the Polytechnical School at Karlsruhe, and hence the new order has to take effect on Heidelberg alone, but this, of course, is of very great importance. The Swiss universities have long been open to women; at Leipzig, women have for some time studied by the side of men exactly as if that had been the order of nature from the beginning of the world; Heidelberg, Berlin (and probably Göttingen, too) have succumbed this year; Oxford and Cambridge are victories of an older date. In face of this Old World progress, one may read in the last Harvard University Bulletin, from the records of the Corporation, acknowledgments (three times) to Mrs. Henry Draper for $833 given towards the expenses of the Observatory, and to Miss Catherine W. Bruce for $500 towards astronomical publications, and the following entry: "The petition of Miss Marion Hamilton Carter, that she be allowed to take the graduate course in psychology with Prof. James this year, was considered, and the Secretary was directed to say to Miss Carter that such a request cannot now be granted by the University."

The high marks scored by women in the recent Honors Examinations held at London University indicate the quality of intellectual work being done by English college women. Of the six B.A.'s who won a "first class" in classics, five were women; of the four rated "first class" in French and in German, three were women, the "inferior" sex also contributing four out of five post-graduate students bracketed as "first class" in the Art, Theory, and History of Teaching.

There still exists, notoriously, a very widespread inequality between the salaries of men and women holding identical posts in our public schools. A special committee appointed more than a year ago in Baltimore to consider the regrading and equitable adjustment of the salaries of public-school teachers, has just made its report, and the most significant item in the proposed new schedule of pay is the equality in the salaries of male and female assistants in all grammar schools.

Oberlin College has resolved to follow the fashion of Library Bulletins. Its first number, for the current month, is a "Popular Bibliography of Sociology," by John R. Commons, Associate Professor of Political Economy. It can be had free on application to A. S. Root, Librarian. Prof. Commons has aimed to "furnish the general reader, especially the Christian minister and worker, a list of the best available books on important Sociological problems." Each title is annotated.

We have already mentioned part of the contents of the January Bulletin of the Boston Public Library. It remains to call attention to the first instalment of a third and enlarged edition of this Library's important 'Chronological Index to Historical Fiction,' including prose fiction, plays, and poems. The list embraces titles of works not owned by the Library, and these it wishes to procure. It appears that an extensive demand exists for the new edition, which is in charge of Mr. James L. Whitney, as its predecessors were of Mr. Justin Winsor.

Prof. William Morris Davis, of Harvard, issues from the "Geographical Laboratory, Department of Geology," at Cambridge, Mass., a circular of great interest both to professional and to amateur photographers. In brief, he offers to examine, with a view to buying, landscape views as particularized, and indicates how to cater to his wants. The prints should not be smaller than 5x8 inches. Cost of transportation is liberally provided for. Gifts, of course, will be welcomed. The circular will be sent to anybody, and ought to prove a great stimulus to scientific photography from nature, the aim being to accumulate material for the broadest illustration of the physical geography and geology of the United States.

It is a pleasure to greet the Bulletin of the State Library of New York for January, containing the second comparative summary and index of State legislation all over the Union (for 1891). This remarkable contribution to coherent, scientific law-making was conceived by the "ingenious" Mr. Melvil Dewey, as our forefathers would have dubbed him, and has been executed by his assistant, Mr. W. B. Shaw. The Albany lawmakers, having access to the MS. card catalogue from which this Bulletin is finally printed, have a temporary advantage which ought to be apparent in their work.

The *Revue Bleue* of December 26—the last number of the year—published as usual its table of contents and of writers of the last semester, and thus gave occasion to speak of the wide and varied excellence of both. Readers of the review feel this more or less consciously from week to week, but a backward look over a six months' space brings it out in a way that is most striking. One might go very far before finding better criticism than here appears in the work of MM. Henry Bérenger and Édouard Rod; or more solid and weighty political and historical articles than those of M. Alfred Rambaud; or pleasanter sketches of travel than M. Maurice Bouchor's; or more abounding wit and fun than one gets from M. Alfred Capus and M. Ferdinand Vandérem. Yet these are only half-a-dozen of the hundred names before us, and not by any means the names that are most widely known.

—The city of Boston has in preparation a series of biographies of deceased members of its City Council, a task for which its Record Commissioners stood ready constituted. The plates have been finished for a chronological list of all the members, showing their entry into and term of service in either branch, and these have just been used as the first 116 pages of a 'List of Members of the City Councils of Boston, Roxbury, and Charlestown, 1822-1890,' issued at the close of last year. The second part consists of the officers of government displayed for each year. Indexes furnish a clue to the several divisions, and the dead are starred. The bulk of this great labor has fallen on Mr. W. H. Whitmore, Chairman of the Commission. So far as Boston proper is concerned, the lists are, to the initiated, eloquent as mere names; but, also, any one may study the fixity of tenure, the rise by promotion, the changes in the nationality of the population. Beginning in 1822 with the father of Wendell Phillips, Boston has had 29 Mayors, of whom several have been members of Congress and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governors of Massachusetts. Harrison Gray Otis took office at the age of 64, and held it for three years; Jonathan Chapman at 33, the present Mayor at 37, his predecessor at 60; but the average has been 50. Josiah Quincy had six annual terms, but no other Mayor has had more than four, and ten have had but one; only three have been reëlected after an interval. Only six were born out of the State, and five of these were New Englanders; the sixth was a native of Ireland brought young to Boston and educated in her common schools. It was not till 1868 that a "dyed-in-the-wool" Democrat was elected Mayor. Three chairmen of the Board of Aldermen, as many presidents of the Common Council, were advanced to the mayoralty. In 1837, under Mayor Eliot, occurred the famous Broad Street riot between the firemen and the despised Irish population; nine years later the Irish famine increased enormously the emigration, but not till 1859 does a distinctively Irish name appear in the list of the Common Council, where four, and perhaps five, make their début at once—Doherty, Mooney, McCarthy, Riley, and (?) Kelly. Hugh O'Brien, the future Mayor (1885-1888), became an Alderman in 1875—the first, we guess, of his race, unless his colleague, James Power, who reached the Board in 1873, deserves the distinction. In 1890 we reckon in the city government three Irish Aldermen, and at least fifteen Irish Councilmen (out of 74), besides a Rosnosky, a Ratshesky, a Von L. Meyer, side by side with old Boston names like Lowell, Sprague, Parker, Brooks, Bryant, Talbot, Park—to mention no others. Through all these years there have been but six city clerks, a father and son having held the office for sixty consecutive years (1822-1852, 1852-1882).

—A new edition of Gray's poems might seem an impertinence, but Dr. Bradshaw's Aldine edition, 'The Poetical Works of Thomas Gray, English and Latin, edited with an Introduction, Life, Notes, and a Bibliography' (London: Geo. Bell & Sons), claims greater accuracy in the text and fulness in the contents than any previous issue, and the claim is well supported. The corruption of Gray's text is well known, and his poems are misprinted, both in his own works and in all anthologies; for example, not less than six errors in the "Elegy" alone are noted by the present editor as appearing in some one or other of such careful collections as Ward's 'English Poets' and Palgrave's 'Golden Treasury.' It was to be presumed, however, that Mr. Gosse's late edition would be final; on the contrary, the present editor says that in it "the text of the poems is far from accurate"; and also, while paying the compliment to Mr. Gosse of calling his biography "the most complete yet published," he states that "it contains many inaccuracies." Those who recall our review of the Rev. E. C. Tovey's interesting and valuable volume, 'Gray and His Friends,' will be prepared for some increase in the volume of the text. Dr. Bradshaw has made use of these additions, and it is fairly to be said that, in the present work, we have for the first time all of Gray's verse in an exact text. He tells us, however, that "a great deal of Gray's work still remains unedited," despite the preface to Mr. Gosse's edition. It consists of notes and essays in Gray's commonplace books at Pembroke College, and something also exists in manuscripts in the British Museum, where with the rest are some verses said by Cole to be by Gray. These verses, which were discovered too late to be included among the doubtful poems, will be found in Dr. Bradshaw's introduction, but all the other matter remains unpublished. The editor's notes are very full, and are especially interesting from the number of parallel passages quoted, and various readings, mostly from the original manuscripts. It is not necessary to add that, for the student, this edition must supersede all others.

—In the *Revue Historique* for January-February, Jules Flammermont renews the discussion of the authenticity of Talleyrand's memoirs. His especial object is to demolish the theory that the memoirs, in regular form, never existed, the supposed memoirs consisting, previous to the preparation of Bacourt's "copy," only of a mass of MS. in the shape of loose sheets written at odd times, during a long course of years, as the impulse to write seized their distinguished author. Against this view, the *Revue* writer cites Vitrolles, who says that Talleyrand read him long extracts, sixty or eighty pages at a time, from "large blank-books." This was in 1814, and Talleyrand's object in preparing and privately publishing the memoirs was to persuade the royal family that he had always been a friend of their cause. He hoped to use Vitrolles as a vehicle of communication. Now, the Duc de Broglie says he never received anything except Bacourt's copy, and that the present family representatives of Talleyrand never had any MSS. This being the case, what became of the "large blank-books"? They were destroyed, M. Flammermont thinks, in order that the interpolations and suppressions which Bacourt made at the request of the Duchess of Dino might not be discovered. We have not mentioned all the evidence, but Vitrolles's testimony is the most important.

—In the Paris *Chronique des Arts* of December 26, 1891, M. Adolphe Guillon, correspondent in Paris of the English Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, is of the opinion that a communication from "T. B." in the *Nation* of November 19 does injustice to Mr. Ruskin. "Il proteste," says M. Guillon, "contre la doctrine de M. Ruskin, qui voudrait qu'on ne touchât jamais à un ancien monument." Thereupon, though heartily approving most of what our correspondent says, he maintains that Mr. Ruskin does *not* ask to suffer old buildings to fall down without touching them, but merely that they shall not be completely made over under the pretext of restoring them. To show that this is the extent of Mr. Ruskin's demand, he quotes several sentences from "une note intitulée: 'Restauration ou Destruction.'" M. Guillon seems to us to misapprehend both our correspondent and Mr. Ruskin. We do not understand the former to allow uncontrolled license to such "restoration" as means destruction and reconstruction, but to vindicate the replacement of a ruined stone which has lost its artistic value and its structural utility, by another which shall check dilapidation and shall at the same time, so far as archæology and art permit, serve the æsthetic purposes of the former—and this, if need be, on the large scale. We find, however, the passages quoted from "a note" of Mr. Ruskin—in which, no doubt, he urges conservation of whatever there is to conserve—to be merely extracts from paragraph xix. of the "Lamp of Memory" in the 'Seven Lamps.' But the same paragraph contains these much-quoted sentences:

"Do not let us talk, then, of restoration. The thing is a Lie from beginning to end. You may make a model of a building as you may of a corpse, and your model may have the shell of the old walls within it, as your cast might have the skeleton, with what advantage I neither see nor care; but the old building is destroyed, and that more totally and mercilessly than if it had sunk into a heap of dust or melted into a mass of clay. . . . But, it is said, there may come a necessity for restoration! Granted. Look the necessity full in the face, and understand it on its own terms. It is a necessity for destruction. Accept it as such, pull the building down, throw its stones into neglected corners, make ballast of them, or mortar, if you will; but do it honestly, and do not set up a Lie in their place."

So when he allows us only to "bind it together with iron," or to "stay it with timber," we can hardly be blamed, notwithstanding his explosive manner of speech, for taking him at his word.

—Some years ago Dr. Gustav Wustmann, librarian of the city of Leipzig, delighted the lovers of literature by publishing, under the singular title 'Als der Grossvater die Grossmutter nahm,' an equally singular book: a collection of old-fashioned songs, nursery rhymes, ballads, librettos, tales, which formed the stock of popular quotations in the Germany of two or three generations ago. Just now he has come forward again, and again (as was to be expected) in the part of *laudator temporis acti*. In a little volume, entitled 'Allerhand Sprachdummheiten' (Leipzig: Grunow), he vents his wrath and indignation on what he calls the maltreatment and desecration of the German language by contemporary writers. He thinks that the German language never was in more imminent danger of complete degeneracy than now; that it is flooded with provincialisms, permeated with official absurdities, encumbered with foreign monstrosities; and that, if the present tendency is allowed to go on unchecked, the classic language of the great eighteenth-century writers will soon sound like a foreign tongue to German ears. The degree of exasperation felt by the writer may be imagined from the following astounding proposition: "Take at random from the shop-window of a bookseller a new book written in German prose, no matter on what subject, no matter by whom composed—a professor, a teacher, an official, an architect, a musician, a manufacturer, a 'leading' author, a blue-stocking; open it where you will, and put your finger on any part of the page—within a circle of five centimetres diameter around the point of your finger you will find at least one gross grammatical blunder. That is what we have come to." One may be disposed to doubt the wisdom of such exaggerated statements as these, one may be inclined to see in a large part of what Dr. Wustmann calls symptoms of linguistic decay nothing but a natural growth; but there is at least one point in which he will meet the approval of all thinking men, not only in Germany but everywhere, because it touches a question of international importance: the baneful influence of newspaper language upon the common speech.

—One of the most amusing instances of the effects of slipshod newspaper style given by Dr. Wustmann is the change which the verb *bedingen* has undergone during the last forty years. Grimm's Dictionary (1854) gives the following definitions: *aushalten* (*vorbehalten*), *bestimmen*, *ausnehmen*. Sanders (1860) adds to these: *beschränken*, *von etwas abhängig machen*, *erfordern*. At present it is approved fashion to say: "It is a fact that certain emotions *bedingen* (bring about) stammering," "This corset *bedingt* (insures) a well fitting dress," "With Lessing, critical insight *bedingte* (influenced) his poetical production," "The tension of Laocoon's mus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cles *wird bedingt* (is explained) by bodily suffering," "The growth of Berlin *wurde bedingt* (was made possible) through political events." In short, as Dr. Wustmann says, whenever a writer entertains a dim suspicion that two things have some connection with each other, without being able or inclined to define to himself or others the nature of this connection, he says: This thing *bedingt* that thing. In what order the two things are mentioned—whether he says, Power *bedingt* heat, or Heat *bedingt* power—is a matter of absolute indifference to him. We hope Dr. Wustmann's little book will find many and careful readers. It cannot fail to further linguistic tact and literary refinement even in those who have no immediate interest in the subject with which it deals.

SCHOULER'S UNITED STATES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.

History of the United States of America under the Constitution. By James Schouler. Vol. V. (1847-1861). Dodd, Mead & Co. 1891.

In this volume, the fifth and concluding volume in his projected series, Mr. Schouler covers that stirring period in the political history of the country which extends from May, 1846, under the Administration of President Polk, to March, 1861, under the Administration of President Buchanan. The author claims, and justly claims, to have been the first who has traced out, with "historical painstaking," and with "consecutive research," the nexus of the events that fall under the first era of our national existence, and to have thus bridged over the long intervening chasm which stretches from the Revolution to the Civil War. It is a task which has called for breadth of view, for lucidity of treatment, and for condensation of style. Even those who may find themselves constrained, at many points, to dissent from Mr. Schouler's political prepossessions and from the color which they give to his narrative, will none the less be frank to admit that he has brought to his *magnum opus* a commendable industry in the compilation of his materials, a rare talent for consecutive exposition, a large share of that "ignited logic" which is skilled to fuse the most intractable materials into literary form, and a vivacity of phrase which is never dull because it sometimes errs on the side of excessive piquancy.

In the present volume he is called, like Pollio in the verse of Horace, to walk over the embers of civic feuds that still glow beneath the ashes under which they are covered from sight; and it is hardly to be expected that any historian, however circumspect and wary, should be able to pick his way among these scoriæ of the volcanic period in our politics, without dashing his foot ever and anon against some of the live coals which still hold their wonted fires. And Mr. Schouler takes no pains to conceal the fact that the same set of ideas which seemed pleasing to him in the fluid forms of a once current politics, do but seem still more pleasing to him now that those fluid forms have hardened into the rigid outlines of our *ante-bellum* history. If "history," in the familiar phrase of Freeman, "is past politics, and politics present history," it should not surprise us that the same projections of honest thought are found habitually to reappear in each.

Mr. Schouler makes it abundantly clear that in the great leading differentiations of political opinion among the people of the United States before our civil war, there is one party, and only one, which deserves his approbation as an historian. It is that party which, at any given juncture, adhered tenaciously to the Constitution and its compromises, but sought, as far as practicable, with an opportunism born of the moment, to conciliate submission to law with the aspirations of humanity. Even when the organic law was at variance with the moral order of the world, he seems to think it was entitled to political respect, in the faith or hope that the ameliorations wrought in public opinion by the incidental discussion of this variance would eventually lend a stimulus towards changing the law, so far as it was in conflict with "Divine injunction." With this working hypothesis he finds it easy to demonstrate that the "Conscience Whigs" and the Republicans must be held to have rightly divided the word of truth and found the way of wisdom in each new emergency of our politics from 1846 to 1861, while the Democrats, the "Cotton Whigs," and the Garrisonian Abolitionists, for reasons peculiar to each, were evil continually.

Mr. Schouler sees very clearly that the way of the political compromisers was always hard under the difficulties imposed on them by the presence and antagonism of two distinct social and economic systems in our civil polity. He sees, too, very clearly that the attempt to erect, on the unstable equilibrium created by these conflicting systems, any sentiment and standard of constitutionalism which should be above and beyond the sentiments and standards based on the moral law, was foredoomed to failure. In the case, therefore, of the Democrats and of the "Cotton Whigs," he is able to discern in every instance that their sense of "constitutionalism" was to them a potent source of illusion; and that even when they supposed themselves to be yielding to the most exigent considerations of patriotic duty, they were only blinding their eyes to the eternal verities. With all his admiration for Henry Clay, Mr. Schouler cannot forbear to remark that "this wonderful old shepherd of the people" was too much given to schemes for "log-rolling the moralities," and that, in pursuing a devious way "along the narrow path of national conciliation," he was liable to stumble into the snares and pitfalls set by politicians of the baser sort, who were bent on political gain where he was bent on the public weal. But while Mr. Schouler is severe on Clay and Webster for "log-rolling the moralities," and for having a "slippery grasp of moral differences," he is also severe on the impracticable virtue of the Garrisonian Abolitionists, because they would not "log-roll the moralities" at all, and because, in standing "upon the high platform of moral assertion," they stood too much aloof from the sphere of concrete politics. When Garrison refused with scorn to take part with slaveholders in a Boston course of lectures on slavery, it seems to Mr. Schouler that he acted "as one who kept truth clear of the contamination of free discussion." Between the parties which were too ready to make compromises, and the Garrisonian Abolitionists who would not compromise at all, Mr. Schouler finds, as we have already hinted, that the *via media* was chosen by the "Conscience Whigs," and by the Republican party after the latter had organized itself for the exclusive purpose of preventing the spread of slavery over the free territory of the Union.

Compromise, in matters outside of morals, is of the very essence of politics. "Republics," says the author, "incline to temporize with problems which are found difficult to manage, and temporizing is the essence of all government which is carried on by popular assemblies." The slavery question, because it was a complex of moral and political forces, became the permanent seed-plot of ever-germinant and springing compromises in our civil annals. The problems grew so difficult and so numerous that the people were fatigued by them into the acceptance of any make-shift solution for the pressing emergency. After the compromises of 1850, hollow as was the truce they effected, "the country grew sick of the slavery question," says Mr. Schouler, "and wished agitators at the devil. Good men, North and South, made the Constitution their fetish more than ever, and, like a prudent husband who is yoked with an irritable spouse, they forced themselves to love for the sake of quiet." With the advent of Pierce, and even at a later date with the advent of Buchanan to the Presidency, the great mass of the people, says Mr. Schouler, grew speedily responsive to every prospect of peace, because they "wearied of this moral agitation, and wished to change the subject."

In so writing, Mr. Schouler might have found a natural reason for the existence of the compromisers whom he condemns. It might be supposed, too, that where a false constitutionalism was perpetually crying peace when there was no peace, he would have found some use for the austere prophets and restless agitators who, in season and out of season, set their faces like flint against all compromises outside of the moral law. But he has a more optimistic view than this. He prefers to believe that the very compromises of the Constitution which, in the matter of slavery, were perpetually generating a *false* constitutionalism that wrought to the confusion of Democrats and "Cotton Whigs," served in the end to generate a *true* constitutionalism, which, in the hands of the Republican party, became the very *vis medicatrix* of the nation. This *vis medicatrix*, when used as a salve to mollify the *vulnus immedicabile* of the Republic, had worked like poison; but when used, in the natural selection of events, as a single specific against the extension of slavery, it wrought more potently and more efficaciously, Mr. Schouler thinks, than any affiliation with what he calls "the mischievous agitators who preached down the Union and its restraints." Mr. Schouler is quick to perceive and denounce the constitutionalism of those who undertook to serve two masters under the Fugitive-Slave Law of 1850—that is, to serve the State, which passed "Liberty bills," and the Government of the United States, which passed a bill for the speediest possible recapture of runaway slaves. "Massachusetts," he says, "would not tolerate the idea that any one holding an office of honor or emolument under her should earn the blood-money of slave-hunters." Yet he records it as a homage justly due to the constitutionalism of the Northern opponents of slavery-extension that "they never meant to meddle or interfere with slavery in its local domains." Mr. Lincoln, we know, accepted this constitutionalism in all its length and breadth; and, while professing, in his debates with Douglas, that he had "no taste for catching niggers," he yet said that he yielded his support to *a* fugitive-slave law "because he did not understand that the Constitution which guaranteed that right could be supported without it." This was constitutionalism pure and simple.

It is easy enough to see how the "Cotton Whigs" could justify themselves in supporting the compromises of the Constitution, even when some of its engagements seemed to impinge on the moral law, for they had a "slippery grasp," so Mr. Schouler holds, on moral

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

differences; but it would have been interesting if he had explained how it was that the "Conscience Whigs" could justify themselves in making concessions to slavery, on the simple ground that slavery was entrenched behind the muniments of the Constitution. In so doing they joined hands with "Cotton Whigs" in making the Constitution "a fetish," as Mr. Schouler phrases it. This was the point of view which used to trouble Garrison when he was called to interpret the attitude even of "Conscience Whigs" in the light of the "moralities," and we regret to say that this is a point of view which Mr. Schouler leaves out of sight, while strict to mark the iniquity of the men who had *no* conscience in the service of slavery. He even complains that Calhoun was bitterly unjust to the North on this point. The complaint against Garrison is that, taking the people of the North at their word, and seeing no prospect of putting an end to slavery behind the defences of the Constitution, where "Conscience Whigs" joined hands with "Cotton Whigs" in protecting it, he felt constrained to uphold the "moralities" with what Mr. Schouler calls "his customary Catonian utterance, 'The Union must be destroyed.'"

Without coming to any clarification of ideas under this head, where a clarification was greatly to be desiderated, the author inclines to believe that it was the Mexican war, with its exposure of a Southern ambition to preponderate in the Union, which gave to the moral agitation against slavery a greater force than any inspired by Garrison. What seemed to Garrison a defect in the Republican attitude, because it shuffled moral forces out of sight as against slavery in the States and under the Constitution, or at least masked those forces behind a simply defensive tactics against the extension of slavery, seems to Mr. Schouler a piece of good fortune for the country, however equivocal it may have been in strict ethics. For while this obscurer process of quasi-moral and quasi-political agitation was working in the medley and muddle of public opinion, the Union, he says, was unconsciously nearing the great crisis of our civil war, which was destined to "melt up infallibly all national prepossessions on the subject of domestic systems of labor, and remit the [then] existing era to the irrevocable past." It was at this point that the intense constitutionalism in which the country had been educated was turned into a coigne of vantage and tower of strength for the preservation of the Union. The idea is not novel, but Mr. Schouler gives it a forcible expression in the following words: "So admirable had been the general training and influence of our solid institutions, so deeply loyal and affectionate to the cause of national unity had become the great mass of our American people, that an unseen force bore the Constitution and the vast confederacy bravely and buoyantly through a strife which demolished violently the whole false fabric of race oppression that fifteen States had constructed society upon."

In pointing the moral of his long and interesting story, Mr. Schouler reminds his readers that the rebellion which came in 1861 to try the strength of the Union "had been ripening ever since slavery became a growing force in our Union, partaking of the national spirit of expansion." The collision which compromises had but temporarily postponed was, he sees, "sooner or later inevitable," but he thinks there was an opportunism in the date at which the crisis came, and in the mixed modes under which it emerged. It came when the force of compromise could go no further, and it came in a shape which gave to the "moral agitators their share in the glory of results."

It is not until the reader clearly apprehends the point of view taken by the historian, in so completely subordinating the moral aspects of the anti-slavery agitation to the political, that he can understand why it is that Mr. Schouler practises a good degree of lenity towards compromises when they were made by President Taylor, and looks with allowance on prudent *ménagements* when they emanated from Seward and Lincoln. He denounces the Whigs of the Old School as "trimmers from instinct," who "placed prudent limitations to the contest they waged against slave extension and inhumanity"; but he applauds President Taylor for the prudence with which that chieftain headed off the Wilmot Proviso. The friends of Taylor avowed at the time that his whole policy for the admission of California into the Union, without waiting for an enabling act to be passed by Congress, was in its essence, as Crittenden phrased it, the sum and the substance as well as the foundation of all the other trimming policies devised at that juncture; because, in common with them all, it sought to *avoid* the Wilmot Proviso. Yet this policy commands the approval of Mr. Schouler. The "defection" of Webster, in his "7th of March speech," is roundly scored in the volume before us, but what seemed to many the "defection" of Seward, in *his* "compromise speech" of January 12, 1861, on the eve of the Rebellion, seems to Mr. Schouler an eloquent plea made in the cause of "kindness and conciliation." Yet Mr. Seward confessed in that speech that he was far from having suggested in it "what would have been in harmony with cherished convictions of his own." That is, he was willing to compromise.

It is to be regretted that in giving expression to his contrasted judgments on the men and measures here passed in review, the author should have sometimes indulged in an objurgatory tone which transcends the judicial summing up of candid and impartial history, however germane it may be to the dialect of contemporary politics, in journals of a certain sort. The cause of truth does not gain by embalming in Mr. Schouler's historical amber the gad-flies of an obsolete political vituperation. In the case of a public functionary who has so many other sins to answer for, it seems hardly necessary that the finger of scorn should be three times pointed at Franklin Pierce in this narrative as the hero who fainted on the battle-field of Churubusco, when nothing was proved by that historical syncope save that he was over-forward in rising from a sick-bed at the call of military duty. We are far from sharing in the admiration awarded to Lewis Cass by his latest biographer, but Mr. Schouler exceeds, we submit, the limits of dignified criticism when, after putting that worthy in a pillory as the man who "truckled contemptibly to slaveholders," who "trained among Northern doughfaces," who was "always ready to turn a popular penny with the South," and who, "not content to lick the dust," sometimes "rolled over and over in it," to do obeisance to the Slave Power, he continues to pelt his hapless quarry with the epithets of "doughty," "blinking," "tremulous," "somnolent," etc., etc. Such acrimony of style defeats the ends of just condemnation.

The proof-reading of the volume leaves room for correction. "Soubriquet" does duty for *sobriquet*, and "pronunciamento" for *pronunciamiento*. "Paixham guns" is written instead of Paixhan guns. Gen. Cadwalader is treated to a superfluous "l" in his name. Nicholas P. Trist, Polk's roving diplomatist, is once styled Nicholas B. Trist. William B. Preston of Virginia, President Taylor's Secretary of the Navy, is assigned to South Carolina. Humphrey Marshall of Kentucky is classified in 1855 as a "Democrat and Know-nothing." We believe that at that time he was an "Old Line Whig" and Knownothing. It was not until a later date that he was graduated as a "Breckinridge Democrat." The reference to "Schmucker's Chase" should of course be to Schuckers's 'Chase,' etc., etc.

On the Border with Crook. By Capt. John G. Bourke, Third Cavalry, U. S. A. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891.

THIS handsomely illustrated volume of 491 pages is devoted to a purpose which does Capt. Bourke great credit. An ardent admirer of the late Gen. Crook, under whose orders he served in the Southwest, he has in these pages reared to the memory of that distinguished soldier (equally distinguished by his private character) a monument of respect and of gratitude which could neither be better deserved nor more ably framed. Capt. Bourke accompanied Crook through most of that general's career in the West, and his statements acquire the greater value since in most instances he speaks as an eye-witness of the events which he relates. Many of these events are depicted with a vividity and freshness quite in accordance with the author's former publications. He takes us from New Mexico to Arizona, thence to the Platte. From the Apaches and Moquis we are led among the Sioux and the Shoshones; finally to the Apaches again in Sonora and Chihuahua, on Crook's remarkable "armed peace-mission" into the Sierra Madre. Along with all this we find numberless personal reminiscences, with kindly mention of men who have served well in the army or who have otherwise made themselves prominent. We also find descriptions of local scenes and customs, and especially much in relation to the Indian tribes among which Gen. Crook had to command, to watch, and to fight—an armed peace-maker, and, at the same time, from the impulses of his generous and humane nature, an educator for the savage. It cannot be denied that the "Indian policy" pursued by Crook was one of the most beneficial ever adopted in this country towards the aborigines, and it is only to be regretted that he was not always allowed to carry it out for a sufficient length of time. Capt. Bourke, very naturally, also tries to relieve the regular army of many a reproach brought against it by outsiders, and especially by such as have never found themselves in the trying positions in which our soldiers (and chiefly the officers) are often placed. He is usually successful, but his zeal in that direction also leads him gravely astray.

The marked defect of his book is the same which appears so glaringly in the 'Apache Campaign' published by him a few years ago. In his desire to be the champion of the Army of the United States, he becomes too much of a champion of the Apache. There is an honorable feeling at the bottom of this extreme—the feeling of respect towards a foe who has defended well, or at least tenaciously, his range, and who has at last been subdued. But generosity should not entail injustice to others. The Apaches are not, and have not been, innocent sufferers, except in a few instances, and it is unjust, unhistorical, and untrue to place the blame for the devastations committed by the Apaches on the Spanish régime. If Capt. Bourke would study the Spanish history of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southwest thoroughly, and not merely consult an occasional source at random for the sake of "points," he would understand the insuperable difficulties of living at peace with that tribe, under which the Spaniards labored from the very beginning of their colonizing efforts. He also misconceives the nature of the Apache, his true tribal relations.

The Apache was only a detached fragment of the southwestern Tinneh stock; his bands only outlying hordes, more or less original outcasts, of their mother-tribe, the Navajos, with whom they nearly always were at war. Their entire subsistence was derived from plunder, murder, and rapine, and that before the Spanish entered the North American Southwest. After the first colony had been planted upon New Mexican soil, the Apaches showed an inclination to live at peace with the whites, but on one condition, namely, that they should be free to prey upon the Pueblo Indians, as had been their custom from time immemorial. This the Spaniards could not consent to; and hence the constant warfare which has desolated the Southwest until the United States, with ample power and ample means at their disposal, succeeded in subduing the unruly savage. There is not the slightest doubt that during the nearly three centuries of warfare between the Spaniards and the Apaches, the former committed many wrongs; but then, exasperation may be pleaded as well for the Spaniard as for the settlers of any part of English America.

Captain Bourke is careful not to touch upon pages of the modern history of Arizona and New Mexico which find a worthy place by the side of his quotations regarding Spanish cruelties. His version of the Arivaypa massacre omits a very essential point. It is true that women and children were the majority of sufferers, but it should also be stated that the Papagos had been cruelly worried for a long time previous by the Apaches, and that they were anxious to take some terrible revenge. That revenge accidentally fell upon non-combatants, but only accidentally, and not intentionally. Captain Bourke is careful, again, in his book not to mention such occurrences as the "Pinole treaties," the killing of Mangas Coloradas, and the attempt to seize Chis (Cachise) undertaken by an officer of the United States Army. He lays all the blame of Apache hostilities upon the Spaniards. Only ignorance of well-established historical facts can excuse this injustice on his part.

We have now indicated the weak side of Capt. Bourke's otherwise very interesting and, for contemporaneous history, valuable book. The weak points cover but a few pages, comparatively speaking. The remainder is, as already stated, an interesting sketch of the life of a good man, written by one who was associated with his labors for some time and often under very trying circumstances. For a knowledge of life in the Southwest, too, the book is a valuable contribution.

Jerusalem, the Holy City; Its History and Hope. By Mrs. Oliphant. With wood-engravings from drawings by Hamilton Aidé and photographs by F. M. Good. Macmillan & Co. 1891.

Mrs. Oliphant has often before now abused the confidence of a generous public, but she has never heretofore done anything so unworthy of herself as is her latest book. For the critical study of the Bible and for its results, she has an unqualified contempt, and has not allowed them to affect her rhetorical improvisation in the least degree. "I have no claim," she says, "to set myself forth as one who has any authority in these matters, but I may say on my own part, what every individual has a right to say, that to transfer my faith and confidence from the writers of the Old Testament to the Herrn Wellhausen, Kuenen, etc., would seem to me the wildest insanity. Moses and Samuel I know, but who are these?" It is not to be expected that a lady who enjoys a personal acquaintance with Moses and Samuel should care much for modern scholars; but if there is any further excuse for her ill opinion of these, it is that it is based, apparently, upon an almost exclusive acquaintance, however moderate, with Renan. What she says of his spiritual incapacity is true, but she has no right to impute it to the whole company of scholars. The most presumptuous of them does not presume so much as she in her assertion that in the Old Testament stories we have "the unvarnished record" of the lives of Abraham and David and other heroes of antiquity. Such catering to ignorance and prejudice is very pitiful in a woman who need not strain beyond her sphere to win an honorable fame.

The erudite are warned away: "Let them not lose ten tickings of their watch on this unprofitable writing." But the unlearned people could go further and fare better. This hasty paraphrase is of the "easy writing" sort that "makes hard reading." For interest and attraction it does not compare with the semi-critical and immensely picturesque pages of Dean Stanley, covering the Old Testament and Maccabean parts. In the first chapters the author has imposed no restraint upon her intolerable diffusiveness. David has 142 pages. It was evident that, like the sudden increase of the Frenchman's family, "this must be stopped," and consequently we have 100 pages for the prophets and 139 pages for Jesus. Renan could hardly show less incapacity than this for spiritual appreciation of relative values. The upshot of the whole matter would appear to be that, if criticism is to be absolutely discarded, there is no occasion for such books as this. The style is no improvement on that of the Scriptures, and the windy paraphrase and expansion of their simplicity and homely beauty find us often wondering why a gifted woman should have taken so much trouble to rewrite what is written so perfectly. Few, if any, of the critics have done the Bible worse irreverence.

John Winthrop. ["Makers of America."] By Joseph Hopkins Twitchell. Dodd, Mead & Co. 16mo, pp. 245.

The list of persons to be portrayed in this series contains several to whose right in it exception will be taken, but no one will dispute the claim of John Winthrop to a prominent place. Gov. Bradford, in Plymouth, is his only rival, and that colony had very little influence upon later times. But not only was Winthrop the leader in Massachusetts by virtue of his wealth and position in England, he was the best type of the earnest, devout, yet practical Puritan. We feel instinctively that had he appeared in any subsequent generation he would have been a prominent man, in full sympathy with each successive development of the Puritan character.

It would be absurd to attempt to write even a brief sketch of Winthrop's life, apropos of this memoir. The pious care of Robert C. Winthrop, in his two volumes of the Life of his great ancestor, has furnished us with a well-nigh complete record. This sketch is merely a recasting of old materials, giving also some desirable information as to the surroundings of the central figure. Unlike the previous volume on the Rev. Francis Higginson, this volume covers a subject on which retrenchment and condensation are to be studied; and the compiler has certainly done his work with good judgment.

We cannot refrain from criticising the plan which selects Winthrop, Higginson, and Cotton Mather as the three "makers" for Massachusetts. If Increase Mather had been selected instead of his preposterous son, we should gladly assent. But among "makers" we should certainly prefer to see Shirley for colonial times, Hancock and the two Adamses for Revolutionary times, and Josiah Quincy, the great Mayor, for later times. However, "Makers" is a catching phrase, and need not be too closely examined. All the names on the publisher's list are worth consideration, and the series will doubtless furnish sound instruction to readers everywhere.

The Theory of Credit. By Henry Dunning Macleod. Vol. II., Part II. Longmans, Green & Co. 1891.

In some respects this portion of Mr. Macleod's book shows no improvement upon those which have preceded it. There is the same reckless abuse of all other writers who have presumed to enter this field, the same furious denunciation of views advanced a hundred years ago and now utterly without influence or entirely forgotten, the same intolerable deal of repetition. These faults, too, are less excusable because in almost all that is sound in his conclusions the author has been anticipated by Mr. Bagehot, whose work he never mentions. For a clear idea of the development of deposit banking, of the part played by the Bank of England in the financial history of that country, of the causes of panics, and of the policy, forced by experience upon the managers of the Bank, to be adopted in dealing with panics, we should recommend 'Lombard Street' rather than 'The Theory of Credit.'

Yet those who are interested in following the progress of financial theory in its historical development will find a great deal that is valuable in this book, if they will be at the pains to separate it from the masses of "scandalous and irrelevant matter" in which it is embedded. The substance of most of the statutes affecting banking in England generally, as well as of those relating particularly to the Banks of England, Scotland, and Ireland, is given, and is for the most part intelligently summarized. The details of the great panics for a century past, their causes, progress, and termination, are stated so as to exhibit effectively the disastrous working of false theories and the beneficial effects of those which are sound. It is impossible not to be impressed, as we review these incidents, with the wonderful advances made in monetary science during this period, although, so far as our own country is concerned, our legislators have not displayed great proficiency in the art. Nor are we disposed to disagree with Mr. Macleod, except as to tone and manner of expression, in his animadversions upon the wisdom of Parliament in retaining the act of 1844, under which the Bank has failed three times, while compelled to keep £10,000,000 in gold in its vaults which it was unable to touch.

In one respect, we think that Mr. Macleod has added to the principles that should govern the Bank in dealing with a financial panic. He points out, in describing the crisis of 1890, that raising the rate of discount is too slow a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remedy for sudden emergencies, and that if Mr. Lidderdale had waited for Barings to fail, with their £21,000,000 of liabilities, the Bank could not have withstood the strain that would have come upon it. But by borrowing £5,000,000 gold on the Continent, it put itself in so strong a position that apprehension was allayed before it had time to become uncontrollable, while at the same time the other banks of the United Kingdom were called upon to join in subscribing for a guarantee fund. From this Mr. Macleod deduces the conclusion that, with its present limitations on issue, it may happen that the Bank may encounter danger in applying the ordinarily safe rule of raising the rate of discount, as too great a rise might aggravate the panic and bring on a run for notes and gold. He also argues that hereafter it should be the rule in serious emergencies for all the banks to combine. These conclusions seem unexceptionable, and mark a distinct advance in the evolution of banking; not only a change from remedial to preventive treatment, but also a broadening to an international basis. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to go so far as to maintain, as Mr. Macleod does, that there should be no restriction whatever on the power of the Bank to issue notes. He has abundantly shown that such a power is liable to dangerous abuse.

Short Studies in Literature. By Hamilton Wright Mabie. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1891.

Mr. Mabie in his preface expresses a hope that this volume of essays may prove "a book of insight, rather than a contribution to the large and invaluable mass of books of literary scholarship." He appears to mean by this that he deals with literature in general, rather than with particular authors, and uses the latter purely for purposes of illustration. The ideas which he brings forward make no pretence of originality. He treats of material and form, of race and personality, of nature and the spirit of the age, of naturalism, classicism, and romanticism, of the epic, the drama, and the lyric, of criticism and the novel, and of the interaction of one nation upon another in the world's literature. He thus passes in review the whole historic field of literary form, and examines the watchwords of all critical schools. In general, his presentation is just, his illustrations sufficiently apt, and his own remarks show both a tolerant and progressive spirit. As an introduction to the general ideas which are involved in the knowledge of literature and the critical appreciation of it, his work could hardly be bettered. It is a first-book for the more reflective class of readers. He succeeds in the rather difficult task of attempting to throw into a popular and easily apprehended shape notions which for their full understanding require large knowledge, but which nevertheless are useful as guides, even in crude form, from the start. Perhaps those chapters which deal with the history of the poetry of nature, and which define the epic as a form of popular poetry created by the imagination and life of a race, have higher usefulness, owing to their greater definiteness; but even in the more abstruse portions relating to form and spirit, what he has to say is distinctly suggestive, and should prove valuable.

Personal Recollections of the War of the Rebellion. Addresses delivered before the New York Commandery of the Loyal Legion of the United States, 1883-1891. Edited by James Grant Wilson and Titus Munson Coan, M.D. Published by the Commandery.

The danger in editing these volumes is that stale or trifling matter be admitted. The typical papers which contain the authentic personal recollections of officers who served in the civil war cannot be too highly estimated. In the present volume, the paper on Gettysburg, by Col. Rafferty; the Red River Dam, by Gen. J. G. Wilson; the Sassacus and the Albemarle, by Dr. Edgar Holden; and the Mortar Flotilla in the Mississippi, by Lieut. Brown, are all of the highest order in value, and the stories are well told. The paper by Gen. Swayne on the Fruition of the Ordinance of 1787, though not immediately connected with the war history, is an able résumé of the history of the great Act of Congress which was at the foundation of the free-State policy whose ultimate fruition was the abolition of slavery at the close of the great convulsion. Gen. Burnett's two papers on the trial of President Lincoln's assassins preserve important facts as seen from the inside by a responsible officer of the Judge Advocate's department. Several of the obituary addresses must be regarded as excerpts already published elsewhere; and interesting as they are, it is questionable whether the rigid rule of admitting to these volumes nothing but original matter first read before the Commandery ought to be relaxed.

The volume is a handsome octavo of 400 pages, in the bright blue and gold, with the cross of the Legion on the cover, which the Ohio Commandery first adopted. It would be well if all the Loyal Legion publications should be put in this uniform, as they are the papers of one society, and the necessary distinction of commanderies could be indicated in the titles.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barker's Facts and Figures for 1892. Frederick Warne & Co. 50 cents.
Brief Counsels concerning Business. F. H. Revell Co. $1.
Choate, I. B. Wells of English. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.50.
Corson, Prof. H. An Introduction to the Study of Robert Browning's Poetry. 2d ed. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Credo and Credulity. Charles T. Dillingham. $1.50.
Crump, C. G. Landor's Imaginary Conversations. Vol. IV. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Cumming, C. F. G. Two Happy Years in Ceylon. 2 vols. Scribners. $9.
Cyclopædia of the Manufactures and Products of the U. S. 2d ed. Seeger & Guernsey Co.
Gosse, Edmund. Gossip in a Library. John W. Lovell Co.
Hopkins, A. A. The *Scientific American* Cyclopædia of Receipts, Notes and Queries. Munn & Co. $5.
Infantry Drill Regulations, U. S. Army. Appletons.
Jokai, Maurus. Pretty Michal. Cassell Publishing Co. 50 cents.
Joynes, Prof. E. S. French Fairy Tales. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 35 cents.
Keene, H. G. The Literature of France. [University Extension Series.] Scribners. $1.
Keener, Prof. W. A. Selections from Leake's Elements of the Law of Contracts, etc. 2 vols. Baker, Voorhis & Co.
La Brête, Jean de. Mon Oncle et Mon Curé. William R. Jenkins. 60 cents.
Ladd, H. O. The Story of New Mexico. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.50.
Littell's Living Age. Oct.–Dec., 1891. Boston: Littell & Co.
Long, George. A Selection from the Discourses of Epictetus, with the Encheiridion. [Knickerbocker Nuggets.] G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.
Marshall, G. L. O'er Rail and Cross-Ties with Gripsack. G. W. Dillingham.
Maspéro, G. Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria. Appletons.
McKillop, D. Shorthand and Typewriting. New York: Fowler & Wells Co.
Mendeléeff, D. The Principles of Chemistry. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. $10.
Meredith, George. The Tragic Comedians: A Study in a Well-known Story. Roberts Bros. $1.50.
Middleton, E. S. A Study in Girls. G. W. Dillingham.
Mills, Wesley. The Dog in Health and in Disease. Appletons.
Morley, Charles. Teufel the Terrier. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 75 cents.
Morris, William. The Story of the Glittering Plain. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.50.
Perley, Sidney. Historic Storms of New England. Salem, Mass.: Salem Press Publishing and Printing Co.
Pinero, A. W. The Cabinet Minister. J. W. Lovell Co. $1.25.
Purves, John. Selections from the Dialogues of Plato. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Religious Systems of the World. 2d ed., enlarged. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $4.50.
Richardson, Warren. Dr. Zell and the Princess Charlotte. L. Kabis & Co.
Ritter, Fanny R. Lyre, Pen and Pencil. Edward Schuberth & Co.
Robida, A. "Yester-Year": Ten Centuries of Toilette. London: Richard Clay & Sons; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.
Ross, Albert. The Garston Bigamy. G. W. Dillingham.
Ross, Clinton. Improbable Tales. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.
Rubinstein, Anton. A Conversation on Music. Chas. F. Tretbar. $1.
Russell, W. C. A Strange Elopement. Macmillan & Co. $1.
Schele de Vere, Prof. The French Verb. William R. Jenkins. $1.25.
Scollard, Clinton. Giovio and Giulia; A Metrical Romance. Clinton, N. Y.: The Author. $1.
Sergeant, Adeline. Sir Anthony's Secret: or, A False Position. John A. Taylor & Co. 50 cents.
Shoup, W. J. The History and Science of Education. American Book Co. $1.
Skating, Curling, etc. [The Badminton Library.] London: Longmans, Green & Co.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

FEBRUARY
EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.

Articles.—The Idea of Liberal Education, Daniel C. Gilman; Growth of the Colleges of the United States, Arthur M. Comey; College Entrance Requirements in English, Henry S. Pancoast; Certain Dangerous Tendencies in Education, James P. Munroe.
Discussions.—Elementary Science in School Courses, Louisa Parsons Hopkins; An Instructive Experiment in College Government, John Bigham; City School Supervision, V., William T. Harris.
Education in Foreign Periodicals.—Henri Pestalozzi.
Reviews—Editorials.
$3 a year. 35c. a number. Monthly except August and September.
HENRY HOLT & CO., New York

FINE PICTURES
AT MODERATE PRICES.
HIGH-CLASS
Etchings, Engravings, and Water Colors.
FREDERICK KEPPEL & CO., Paris, and
20 East 16th St., between Union Square and Fifth Ave.

Letters of Credit.
We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.
Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
No. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

Anton Rubinstein's
New book, entitled "A CONVERSATION ON MUSIC," translated by Mrs. John P. Morgan. Cloth, $1.
CHARLES F. TRETBAR, Steinway Hall, New York.

EQUITABLE
MORTGAGE COMPANY
Condensed Statement, June 30, 1891.
Capital authorized.....$4,000,000 00
Paid (in cash).....2,049,550 00
Surplus and undivided profits.....830,396 67
Assets.....14,074,813 56
This company solicits correspondence about all first-class investment securities.
Buys and negotiates Municipal, Railroad, Water, Industrial, and Irrigation Bonds.
Issues its debentures and negotiates mortgage loans.
CHARLES N. FOWLER, President.
Charles Benj. Wilkinson, Vice-President.
B. P. Shawhan, Sec'y and Treas.
OFFICES.
New York, 208 Broadway | Boston, 117 Devonshire St.
Phila., 4th & Chestnut Sts. | Kansas City, Missouri.
London, England. | Berlin, Germany.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED